

AFTER THE CONGRESS

THE measure of notice given by the secular press of this country to the proceedings of the Liverpool Catholic Congress, the first since the war and the sixth of the whole series, forms in inverse ratio a measure of the need of such a gathering. The Congress was an assembly of the Catholic prelates, pastors, and people of this land, bent on developing the civilizing mission of Christ's Church, and thus averting the destruction to which a godless materialism is hastening the world, but the secular press went on its way, as the peoples did in the days of Noah, and either ignored the Congress entirely or published only such small fragments of its proceedings as would yield effective headlines. As far as the secular and non-Catholic papers were concerned, the message of the Congress might as well have not been delivered: the light and leading to be found in the application of the traditional moral principles of Christendom to current crucial questions were idly passed over by a press which devotes columns to the vapourings of a Vale Owen or the degrading revelations of the divorce-courts. By their papers, we may say, shall ye know them. No worse sign of the decay of Christian civilization in our midst is to be found than the almost entire apostasy from the Christian ideal of the secular press.

However, those of the faithful, the vigour of whose faith impels them to buy our Catholic weekly journals, have had provided for them a fairly full account of the proceedings of the Congress and the opportunity of reading, in summary or in full, at least the more important addresses. Accordingly, there is no need in a monthly review to aim at giving an historical record of the event: it will be more useful to determine, from a general survey, what are the chief lessons to be learnt from that three-days discussion of urgent questions and what the Catholic body, having through its representatives *spoken*, should, individually and collectively, proceed to *do*.

The first practical matter that suggests itself is one that concerns time and place. The Liverpool Congress followed the precedent set by the three first, and chose for its assembling the August Bank Holiday and the two days immediately

preceding. On the other hand, the meetings at Plymouth in 1913, and at Cardiff in 1914, were held in the early part of July. The later date has obviously in view the convenience of the greater number, the army of workers, black-coated or not, who are not free to take a "long week-end" except at Bank-holiday time. Still, August is the holiday season *par excellence*, and it is debatable whether many even of the workers who would otherwise attend are not already on vacation when the Congress starts. This is a matter which can only be settled after many years of experience, and the annual Congress is too young yet to afford adequate grounds for decision.

The more so because the choice of locality makes so much difference. In populous centres local Catholics may be counted on to supply the audiences: in smaller places the numbers must be largely imported, and expense is greater because of the scarcity of accommodation. Now that abnormal railway fares have come to add to the difficulty of long-distance travel, it would seem that the Congress must confine itself to great Catholic centres, and that places like Norwich or Oxford or Salisbury or Lincoln, where the Congress would not be swallowed up in the midst of a vast non-Catholic population, are for the present ruled out. Small as England is, it is difficult to bring Catholics together on a national scale, and, until locomotion becomes more rapid and more cheap, North and South must remain apart, and the East and West see little of each other.

The Catholics of the diocese of Liverpool, with its close neighbour Salford, amount to more than a third of the whole total for England, so that there was no fear of a lack of numbers at the Congress. Nor was there, in fact, although no one can say what proportion of them were visitors. Still, there was a feeling, which was occasionally perceptible yet lacked very definite grounds, that Liverpool Catholics were not thoroughly united in their support of the Congress, and, if one strove to find its source, one met with indications of that age-long feud which, systematically started in Ireland by the various Protestant "plantings," and thenceforward fostered for political reasons, has become a standing obstruction to complete Catholic unity in this country, and will, we fear, remain so, until justice inaugurates peace between the two nations. It would be disingenuous to ignore this influence, for unless recognized, men will not, as they should, try

to eliminate it, and Catholic progress will be hampered for many a long day. It was, as we have said, only slightly manifest at Liverpool, but it cheated one somewhat of the full enthusiasm which one expected in that great Catholic community.

A critic of the Norwich Congress in 1912 called attention in the *Universe*, for August 23rd of that year, to the indisputable fact that the Congress was not truly national. He did not refer precisely to the absence of the *élite* of the Catholic body, those who by virtue of rank or wealth or ability occupy prominent positions amongst us—although they, as a matter of fact, are generally poorly represented—but rather had in view "land-owners, mine-owners, mill-owners, farmers, traders, bankers, professional men," people, in fact, who are engaged in directing the work of the country. Now, classes of men can be officially "represented" only by those who are formally appointed, and formal appointment presupposes organization. It would be ludicrous to expect these various categories of Catholics to be organized into societies, but there has come into increasing prominence, since the Norwich Congress, a body which itself unites for religious and philanthropic purposes most of these directing classes, we mean the Catenian Association, and this great body, which numbered some ten centres at Plymouth seven years ago, and now numbers forty-six, being at the time in session at Liverpool, was, we were glad to see, well represented at the Congress. They are the nearest approach we have to that great American organization, the Knights of Columbus, and in their efforts on behalf of the cause of Catholicity, emulate worthily their brethren of the States. We are still far from the ideal when the Catholic body, which *par excellence* stands for unity and universality, shall show its real power at these gatherings, but, having in mind the catastrophe of the war, our fewness, isolation, and travelling difficulties, we have made substantial progress towards it.

There were some new societies taking part in the meeting to compensate for others who for one reason or another had dropped out. We were disappointed that the Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists, a body the influence of which, in view of the present vagaries of Labour, is more and more necessary, and which was much in evidence at the last two Congresses, was not convened for this occasion. Another conspicuous omission concerns the Temperance organizations of

the Church in England, which neither singly nor in their federated form, made any appearance. Yet, considering on the one hand the great recrudescence of the drink evil since the war, and on the other the attempts made or threatened by the Prohibitionists to cope with it by methods not in accord with Christian morality, the re-statement of the Church's attitude towards this pressing problem was never more essential. The other omissions we noted were of lesser moment, and were probably due to the abiding consequences of war-conditions. The associations new to the Congress were chiefly those connected with the Universities and the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society. The former are so new that they have not yet federated themselves, and the final result of their deliberations was the appointment of a Committee to draft a federal constitution to be submitted to the various University societies at the beginning of next term. Meanwhile, much was heard of one already existing and powerful bond of union, *The Inter-University Magazine*, which, in the few months of its existence, has done much to create a feeling of fellowship, not only between the Catholic members of the various Universities of England and Scotland, but between them and Catholic students abroad. We are evidently, in this, on the threshold of a great movement, which may restore to some extent the catholicity of University education destroyed at the Reformation.

At previous Congresses we have always admired the courage and persistence which the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society showed in attending, holding informal meetings and distributing their literature without being officially recognized. They were Peris at the gate. But the concession of the Parliamentary vote in 1918 having admitted them to Paradise, they are now entitled to consort with the rest of the elect. We are heartily glad of it. They have still work to do, for though the suffrage has been granted and Parliament itself is now open to them, and they may take their seats on Juries, they have still to get the male mentality out of the ancient grooves, and induce a practical recognition of the essential moral equality of men and women into the thought of coming generations. And this, since all literature is still imbued with the old views, will be no light or speedy task. It was a Catholic love of justice that inspired their original enterprise, and the same spirit must guide its further prosecution.

Of the individual addresses of the Congress, to which we must look for our call to action, the first in importance, both because of its subject and the high position of the speaker, was that delivered at the Inaugural Meeting by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop. With true Catholic instinct, he bade his hearers consider the wider interests of the Church which were being threatened in Palestine, the very cradle of Christianity, and which were calling for support in the various missions to the heathen. In this apparent ignoring of the "home front" there was nothing of the spirit of Mrs. Jellaby. His Eminence knew that home concerns would be exhaustively discussed by others, knew, moreover, that what makes a true Catholic is zeal for the Faith, and that the interests of the Faith are one and the same everywhere. There is nothing merely local about such zeal any more than there is about the Catholic Church herself. Accordingly, in exposing the machinations of a certain party amongst the Jews to use their wealth to expropriate the inhabitants of the Holy Land and to subject the native Christians there to a tyranny worse than that of the Turk, the Cardinal broached a subject of intimate concern to every Catholic heart. It is significant of the loose hold Christianity has upon our present-day statesmen that none of them seemed to realize that the project of Zionism was likely to result in the imposition on the Holy Land, at last liberated from the secular mis-rule of the Mohammedan, of another anti-Christian despotism even more bitter and ruthless. The promise made by Mr. Balfour, on November 2, 1917—a promise doubtless dictated by the urgent need of Jewish financial aid—that the British Government would favour the project of the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish National Home, coupled as it was with the proviso that thereby "the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities" should not be prejudiced nor "the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews elsewhere"—could not mean, on the face of it, that an independent Jewish State would be established there. But, as the Cardinal, during his tour in the East, had exceptional opportunities of knowing, this promise and the consequent activities of fanatical Zionists has filled the inhabitants of Palestine, Moslem and Christian, with consternation. They have appealed to Great Britain, now become their Mandatory, for two years in vain. The Power that should protect them, enable them to develop their resources and shield them from outside exploitation, actually sets a Jew over them as High Commissioner, and

leaves them at the mercy of Jewish finance. The secular press, of course, reported nothing of this serious protest, and was equally silent on the injustice that inspired it. It remains for Catholics to take every occasion to make known the true state of affairs and to press for the application of the remedies suggested by his Eminence, viz., the appointment of a Catholic ecclesiastic as a sort of assessor or adviser of the High Commissioner to represent Catholic interests, the setting up immediately of the promised Commission which is to decide the rights of ownership of the Holy Places, and, finally, since these sacred shrines of Christianity in a sense belong to Christendom as a whole, the giving to the Christian nations some direct share through chosen representatives in their care and guardianship.

In the second part of his address, the Cardinal took up again the subject of Foreign Missions, which had formed the substance of his discourse at Cardiff six years ago. The needs he then dwelt on have been terribly increased by the war, both the need of men and the need of material. And the situation is still more complicated by the continued exclusion from territories under British control of missionaries of German and Austrian nationality. He pleaded for patience, foreshadowing some mitigation of these conditions when peace should have been fully restored, and meanwhile emphasized the greatness and dignity of the missionary vocation—the direct following of the Apostles—and the advantage of removing from the foreign mind the mistaken idea that the English speech was necessarily identified with Protestantism. His Eminence's address brought the work of the missions into great prominence, and the subsequent combined meeting of the various missionary societies was very extensively attended in consequence.

But, as we have before suggested, the fact that the eyes of the Congress were thus on the ends of the earth could not prevent it from giving keen and detailed notice to matters of moment at home. We are not aiming at a record of all the valuable ideas ventilated, or projects suggested or begun. We are looking for a call to action and some sign of guidance. And thus it seems to us that the outstanding impressions of the whole three days of speech and discussion were twofold, corresponding to the two characteristics of Catholicism—Unity and Truth. In other words, the most important movements in the region of home affairs were those directed to creating more effective Catholic co-operation, and more insistent

Catholic propaganda. It may serve, in the light of the Congress discussions, to touch briefly on both these pressing topics.

Catholic Federation is no new topic to our readers, on whom it has been urged from time to time during many years. The formation of societies for good ends is itself a good and even a necessary thing, for only in association can individuals find strength to prosecute their laudable designs. One has only to glance at the Catholic Directory to see how active the Catholic body has been in this regard. But a multiplication of societies for similar good ends is rather a cause of weakness, or at least a waste of energy and a danger to unity. Hence the wisdom of supporting existing bodies rather than forming new ones, and of combining in some form of federation local societies which have practically the same aim. These common-sense measures have occupied the attention of Catholic leaders for many years past. Until the disintegrating effect of the Reformation, which has left its mark upon Catholic social life as well, has been counteracted, we shall never get back to true Catholic unity, the sense that all Catholics belong to one family, the household of the Faith. In spite of all efforts, progress towards this ideal has been slow, partly because of our fewness amongst a large non-Catholic population, partly because of very human local jealousies, partly owing to the still unhealed breach with Ireland. But the efforts, thank God, are persevered in. At the very first Congress at Leeds, 1910, various federal bodies, to the number of twenty, met and drew up a scheme for Confederation, and since that time the "Catholic Confederation" meeting has been a prominent feature at all the Congresses, and has done something, nay, a great deal, to oppose a united Catholic front to various measures unjustly assailing Catholic Faith or practice. But that success is only a shadow of the force it would have if the Confederation were fully realized on the lines of a very striking paper which Mr. Edward Eyre read at the Saturday evening Mass Meeting for Men.¹ He pointed out that since the secular State is becoming more and more irreligious and the non-Catholic bodies more and more materialized, the lists were gradually being arrayed for a conflict between the World and the Church, between Naturalism and Supernaturalism, in which

¹ We are glad to learn that this important appeal, which ably diagnoses the needs and dangers of the times, and suggests a practical measure of defence, will be separately printed. It should be very widely diffused.

the Church must suffer grievously unless her children are organized and prepared for defence. The attack, as we see it maturing to-day, will not be directly on religion, but on morality, on marriage and the rights of the family, on Christian education. The defence cannot be improvised, cannot be conducted by the clergy alone. Therefore, every advantage should be taken of the well-tried diocesan and parochial organization of the Church, which, though tending, if not checked, to produce insular habits of mind, yet affords such an admirable support for a system of complete and united representation: and there should be built up in this country a strong, compact lay-organization, with a council authorized to speak and act for the whole, which should be able at short notice to determine the Catholic attitude and action in face of any threatened assault on their religious rights.

If this inspiring project is thoroughly carried out, if parish units become universal and combine to form diocesan units, and if diocesan units unite in one great national organization, then the Catholic body will be able to speak with the enemy in the gate to some purpose. But more than this. The work has been already accomplished in America where the war has stimulated Catholic activities to an enormous extent. This points the way, as Mr. Mara, General Secretary of the Confederation, indicated in a very suggestive paper, to the formation of an International Federation, co-extensive ultimately with the Church herself, and ready to defend her just rights wherever attacked. That this is no mere dream, but quite realizable, may be shown by what has already been done. The campaign of slander in the English Press against the Holy Father, which grew to a head in 1918, and then suddenly ceased, inspired unity of action by way of protest between the English Catholic Confederation, the American Knights of Columbus, and the British and American Hierarchies. And already the C.W.L. has many international affiliations, and one of the most promising things about the new Catholic University-Students movement here is the eagerness with which news of it is being welcomed by corresponding societies abroad. After all, the forces of evil are internationalized, the high-priests of Mammon, the anti-Christian Freemasons, the "Proletarians," the cosmopolitan Jews—need they be wiser in their generation than the children of light?

To turn now to the other point of cardinal importance

which was discussed at the Congress, but by no means so fully or prominently as it deserved—Catholic Propaganda, the bringing before a misguided, beliefless people the whole contents of Christian revelation and, as a preliminary or concomitant step, the sweeping away of that vast crusted mass of falsehood and prejudice which, since the first lie of the Reformation, has risen between the English people and the truth of Christ. Again, this is no new topic, but rather an old one, the urgency of which increases as the Protestant systems decline and a godless materialism takes their place. It was urged by Father Hugh Pope, O.P., at the Guild of Ransom meeting, and by Father Martindale, S.J., at the Annual Meeting of the C.S.G., and by Father John Pollen before the Catholic Record Society. Moreover, it naturally occupied the attention of a large and enthusiastic gathering of the Catholic Missionary Society, and of the flourishing Catholic Evidence Guild, where Mr. Hand, the Hon. Secretary, read a paper; and, moreover, it was the subject of discussion at a special Press Conference convened by the Catholic Confederation, where Mr. Eyre and Father Garesché, S.J., gave an account of the great Catholic Reconstruction Council in the States. At all these meetings it was felt that, whilst the Christian faith must be preached at all times, *importune*, *opportune*, the present is especially an opportune time, since the war has shown the comparative ineffectiveness of all forms of Christianity other than the Catholic.

The Faith may be spread in three ways—by the example of a good life, the most persuasive way within its measure, by the written, and by the spoken word. The question that comes from the Congress to every Catholic is a very serious one—Am I trading with my talent? Am I *spreading* the Faith? We are all, please God, doing something to recommend Catholicity by the lives we lead before the eyes of men—but are we alive to our duty in other respects? The Church has her official teachers, and no one can lawfully preach unless he be sent: still there is a growing field there for the laymen and the lay-women. The wonderful success that has met the efforts of the Ransomers and the Catholic Evidence Guild in the London parks shows that there is practically no limit to the good that can be done by lay-speakers of education and experience—and due ecclesiastical sanction—addressing the shepherdless crowds in public places. There remains the written word which should be produced and dis-

seminated with all the more instance that people *will* read something, and, if they cannot get truth, will read falsehood, and, unless they get good mental food, will devour what is unhealthy.

Coincident with the opening of the Congress, and therefore very opportunely, there appeared in the Catholic papers an eloquent full-page appeal from the Catholic Truth Society, which shows that that veteran body, the parent of the Congress-movement, is alive to the needs and the signs of the times. The non-Catholic world needs Catholic Truth beyond all things, and there are signs that it will welcome it. Well, the C.T.S., if Catholics will only rise to the height of their duties and opportunities, proposes to bring Catholic Truth to the world in such a way that the world shall not ignore it, viz., by opening a "Retail Department, Information Bureau, and Reading-room in Westminster," or in some equally prominent and populous London centre. It cannot suspend its normal activities or draw on its ordinary funds—even were they sufficient—for this extension of its operations, but what it confidently hopes it *can* draw upon—Catholic zeal for the Faith—should in its opinion enable it to undertake this great development. The advertisement informs us that a guarantee fund of £2,000 per annum for five years would be required to put the project on a sound business footing, and this is the substance of the Society's appeal. There is certainly an element of audacity in such a request at so anxious a financial period from a comparatively poor community like the Catholic. But its very boldness may meet its reward if the issues at stake are only realized, and, in any case, it could easily be done by wide co-operation, whilst there are those amongst us who could materially help without very great sacrifice. After all, *date et dabitur vobis* is an authentic promissory note signed by the very Lord of Truth and Riches Himself. There can be no doubt that the realization of such a scheme, which is of course applicable to other large centres, would give an immense impetus to C.T.S. propaganda, to the general diffusion of Catholic books, to the work of Catholic defence in the press, to the Free Library movement, and to all cognate Catholic activities. But whether by this means or another the call has gone forth from the Congress for Catholics to proclaim their Faith to a creedless generation, and to regard the opportunity of making some sacrifice for that end as but a little payment-on-account for the Pearl of Great Price.

One closes these impressions with reluctance considering how much remains to be said about the other Catholic interests at the Congress. The great Monday meeting for women organized by the C.W.L. was notable for an address by Archbishop McIntyre on "the Catholic Woman's Mission in the Modern World," in which he held up the women of France, women who are still voteless and ineligible for Parliament, as models for emulation. The C.S.G. had provided for its Monday meeting papers of real value by Professor Hewins and Mr. Muir, on the rights of the producer and the consumer respectively. Mgr. Brown's striking address on the need of the recently-formed National Board of Adult Rescue attracted great attention, and the criticism to which the Ministry of Health was subjected at a joint meeting of societies concerned, showed that Catholics were fully alive to the dangers to morality and civil freedom to be apprehended from that body.

Much seed, in a word, was sown in those busy three days. There will undoubtedly be some sort of harvest as the outcome, but whether a hundred- or eighty- or sixty-fold depends on the degree in which those who attended the Congress, and those who have read of it, determine to answer its call to Unity and Truth.

THE EDITOR.

INDIVIDUALITY

THE traits that show my kindred, class, and race,
 The loves and hates that use and wont instil,
 Identity of wealth and work and will
 With countless comrades in life's market-place!
 The self-same paths in which my neighbours pace,
 The common hopes and fears, and good and ill,
 And (where God grants it!) greater oneness still—
 A common Faith, a common Means of Grace!—

This fellowship but shows how wholly mine
 Is the strange solitary self I bear
 Within me, and my nearest cannot share.—
 The soul's deep cup, filled with its secret wine!
 The soul's walled garden, where the Guest Divine
 Comes, seeking fruit that grows no otherwhere!

G. M. HORT.

INDUSTRIAL CHAOS—AND A WAY OUT?

ARE we, in this country, heading for a revolution, an industrial and economic revolution, a revolution, if not violent and bloody, at least cataclysmic and disastrous? That we are, unless we mend our ways betimes and that very speedily, is the conviction of—among others—Mr. G. D. H. Cole, with whose recent work, *Chaos and Order in Industry*, the following pages will be mainly concerned. Writing of a certain proposed "adventure" in the matter of economic and industrial "reconstruction," an adventure the nature of which shall be presently explained, he expresses himself thus:

I do not suggest that the whole change can be made in a moment; . . . but I do suggest that our only alternative to this adventure is a gradual but speedy descent into the abyss. Moreover we must adventure boldly and at once. Time is against us, and the old order is dissolving into anarchy and chaos much faster than we are at present building the new. When I suggest that the change will be gradual, I am far from meaning that it can be slow. It must be rapid and decisive, if the work of construction is to be put in hand quickly enough to forestall the impending collapse. For I do sincerely believe that the present economic order is breaking down, and that its definite collapse is a matter not of decades, but of years.¹

And again, on the general situation, he writes:

To-day most of the world, and the workers perhaps most of all, have lost the feeling of certainty about anything. We have come through such changes already that no change for better or worse now seems altogether impossible. Empires, apparently strong and impregnable, have perished almost in a night; new nations have arisen; one great country is actually governed by extreme Socialists, and several others by Socialists of a milder type. After the fall of the Hapsburgs, the Hohenzollerns and the Romanoffs, after the coming of Soviet Russia and, for a time of Soviet Hungary, who, whatever his attitude towards these things, will dare to affirm that revolutionary changes are impossible in his own country? Who will hold an untarnished faith in the permanence and inviolability of the old order? ²

¹ *Chaos and Order in Industry*. By G. D. H. Cole. (Methuen, 1920.) Pp. 23—24.

² P. 9.

These are strong words, well calculated to arrest the attention even of the most casual reader. And gravely as one may reasonably deprecate unduly alarmist prognostications, as being extremely apt—even if not deliberately calculated—to enhance that very unrestfulness which they profess only to record, yet seeing that, with the possible exception of Mr. Sidney Webb, Mr. Cole is, just now, by far the ablest, the most clear-sighted, the most definitely constructive exponent of the aspirations—largely vague and inarticulate—of at least a very powerful section of "Labour," his gloomy forecast may be taken as rendering superfluous any apology for devoting as many pages as the Editor can spare to a serious consideration of the volume from which it has been borrowed.

Amid the welter of divergent opinions on the subject of industrial and economic reconstruction, the deepest cleavage is between the views, on the one hand, of those who, as the war drew to its close, looked for a gradual repairing, with improvements, of the old social and industrial structure, and, on the other hand, of those who eagerly hoped that the war would afford the occasion for a successful onset upon walls already battered and believed or imagined to be crumbling to their fall, and for a rebuilding of the edifice from its foundations. "We want no tinkering with the old capitalist system, none of your benevolent but futile attempts to bolster it up; the capitalist system has been tried and found wanting, and it has got to be scrapped." Such, in effect, were the words addressed to the present writer, in the autumn of 1917, by a very active and intelligent Trade Union official; and they express, in substance, the thoughts and hopes and ultimate aims of a very large number of industrial workers of all grades at the present time. And with them, even more emphatically and explicitly than in his earlier books, Mr. Cole now ranges himself. With, however, this difference, that he has a far clearer vision than the average discontented worker of the state of things by which, if we are to escape the abyss of anarchy, the old order must—according to him—be replaced.

What then is to be understood by "the old order," "the capitalist system," which Mr. Cole and so many others would, if they could, and will, if they can, relegate to the scrap heap? Before attempting to answer this question it may be useful, though it ought not to be necessary, to put aside certain absurdities which are not advocated even by the wildest of

the "wild men" of labour. Any suggestion, for instance, that all capital should be abolished would be the merest foolishness, for the simple reason that capital, by whomsoever owned, is an indispensable factor in all but the most primitive kind of production. Every spade, hoe, wheelbarrow, every needle and reel of thread, every pair of scissors or of nut-crackers, no less than every steam engine, or warehouse, or electric installation, falls under the head of capital. Nor, again, is it any longer seriously proposed—and most certainly not by Mr. Cole—that all private property, or private capital, should be pooled for the benefit of the community. Whatever anyone may say or write about "the common ownership of all the means of production, transport, and exchange," no one who needs to be reckoned with would propose that our spades and wheelbarrows, our flat-irons and rolling-pins, should be held in common and borrowed from a national or municipal dépôt. At the utmost it is only the instruments of industry on a more or less considerable scale that anyone who is not a mere dreamer would wish to communalize.¹

Nay, more than this. The most determined enemy of the capitalist system, as it at present exists, may quite consistently hold that a wide diffusion or distribution of "capital," held in relatively small amounts by a very large and ever-increasing proportion of the population, is in the highest degree desirable, on the ground that the truest prosperity is to be found in a country where no one is very rich, few very poor, and no one, except by his own fault, destitute. Far from desiring what is now the fashion to call "the dictatorship of the proletariat," which in practice would be found to mean the enslavement of the proletariat and of every one else under the iron heel of a few astute politicians *à la Russe*, it is quite consistent with a vehement dislike of "the capitalist system" to desire that the numbers, and consequently the political power of the proletariat, properly so-called, should be gradually reduced to a minimum. For a "proletarian," in the strict sense of the term, is one whose livelihood depends

¹ It may be observed here, once for all, that Mr. Cole is no "State Socialist" or Fabian, holding as he does the views of Mr. Sidney Webb and Sir L. Chiozza Money in undisguised contempt. State Socialism, according to him (and in this point common sense will support him), means an inefficient bureaucracy at one end of the scale and slavery at the other. Guild Socialism, he maintains, will be free from both these evils. The general theory of Guild Socialism is expounded in Mr. Cole's *Self-Government in Industry* (Bell & Sons, 1917), to which Mr. Francis Goldwell has written a very able reply under the title of *Guild Socialism*, published by the Catholic Social Guild.

exclusively on a daily or weekly wage, or a monthly or quarterly salary; one who has no other source of income, and has nothing in reserve on which he can fall back in case of sickness, disablement, or inculpable unemployment.

Once more, then, what is "the capitalist system," of which many persons, of more "moderate" views than Mr. Cole, would wish to see the peaceful end, provided only (there of course is the rub) that something more satisfactory can be found to replace it, and to replace it by a process which shall involve no injustice to anyone? Its characteristic features may, I think, be summarized under these four heads, viz.:

1. The accumulation of immense stocks or holdings of capital, whether in the form of hard cash or of credit, of land, of raw materials, or of plant, in the hands of a relatively small number of persons.¹

2. The vesting of the effective control of industry more or less entirely in the holders of capital as such.

3. The inevitably consequent struggle, by the greater capitalists more particularly, to secure, by means either of competition, or of combination, or of various methods of "rigging the market," the maximum of profit.

4. The no less inevitable tendency towards the "exploitation" of the workers, and their reduction to the condition of a true proletariat.

Now of these four points, the first, third, and fourth are certainly not in harmony with sound Catholic principles. The piling up of colossal fortunes in the hands of a few is one of the evils most explicitly deplored by Leo XIII.; another is the reduction of the workers to the condition of mere wage-slaves; and the making of exorbitant profits, or in other words, the exacting of exorbitant interest on invested capital (capital too often "watered" to mask its real value) is an infringement of the natural law, as declared through the ages by the teaching of the Catholic Church on usury.² And as

¹ For present purposes land may be classed with "capital."

² "By degrees it has come to pass that working-men have been surrendered, all isolated and helpless [this was in 1891], to the hardheartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition. The mischief has been increased by rapacious usury, which, though more than once condemned by the Church, is nevertheless, under a different guise but with the like injustice, still practised by covetous and grasping men. To this must be added . . . the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals; so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself." (Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum," in *The Pope and the People*, p. 179.)

for the second of the four points specified above, viz., the vesting of the control of industry more or less entirely in the hands of the holders of capital as such, it is not only intimately bound up with the other three, but calls for no defence on any ground of moral principle.

Nor do the objections which lie against the capitalist system, as described above, rest on theoretical considerations alone. Of the actual working of the system in this country in the days when it enjoyed full sway, a lurid but truthful picture has been drawn by, among other writers, Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, in their valuable monographs on *The Village Labourer*, *The Town Labourer*, and *The Skilled Labourer*, respectively; and its still more harmful working in the United States has been abundantly illustrated, not only in Jack London's *The Iron Heel*, and in Upton Sinclair's *King Coal*, *The Jungle*, and *The Metropolis*, but also in the less strongly partisan writings of Mr. Winston Churchill.¹ These, of course, are all works of fiction, in which allowance must be made for exaggeration, and for the exaggerating effect of literary fore-shortening, but they, together with many other books, bear concurrent witness to the multitudinous and many-sided abuses arising from the predominant "power of the purse" in politics and in social life no less than in the domain of industry. And the note of alarm has been sounded from more than one quarter lest English trade, English industry, and English politics should become more and more thoroughly and mischievously "Americanized."

All this being so, we need not, as Catholics, feel in the least alarmed or shocked as though something dreadfully dangerous or horribly wicked were being suggested, merely because someone calls aloud for the abolition or supersession, not of capital or even of private capital, but of the capitalistic system as a whole. We may indeed entertain doubts as to whether any projected attempt to bring this about is likely to succeed. And we do well to be very keenly on the alert as to the moral rectitude of this or that means by which it may

¹ *Coniston* exhibits the rise of the political "Boss"; *Mr. Crewe's Career* that of the political influence of the Railway corporations; *In a Far Country* that of the Banker-Financier; *The Dwelling Place of Light* and *The Inside of the Cup* illustrate the effect of modern financial conditions on the lives of the workers, and the growing unrest and discontent. Unfortunately in the three last-named works the treatment of industrial problems is progressively more and more fully flavoured with "modernist" views of religion. They cannot, therefore, be recommended for indiscriminate reading.

be proposed to compass what is desired. On the other hand, in view, not merely of abstract principles but of actual abuses and dangers from the side of capital, and likewise of the present temper of "Labour" and of its growing power to throw the whole machinery of production and distribution very disastrously out of gear, we shall do well to give a sympathetic hearing to a constructive scheme such as that of which Mr. Cole has become the eloquent and persuasive advocate. And the more so because his industrial programme has for its aim to put the clock back, not to 1913 or 1914, but to the days when capitalism in its modern form had not yet reared its ugly head, and when industry was organized mainly under the control of Industrial Guilds and Guilds Merchant, with due allowance of course for such very considerable modifications as the physical conditions of production by machinery; and all that it implies, imperatively require.

The marrow of the scheme is just this, that industry should, as far and as soon as possible, be withdrawn from the control of the capitalist as such, and brought under that of the workers; not of the manual workers alone, but of "the workers by hand and brain." The capitalist is to be "bought out" and reduced to the condition of a *rentier*, entitled only to a moderate interest on the genuine value of his (unwatered) stock. This, it may be observed in passing, is precisely the position held by that very large and growing class of persons who have invested their savings or some portion of them in the Co-operative Societies throughout the country. Their holdings of stock or shares, whether larger or smaller, give them no voice whatever in the management of the various concerns, and entitle them only to a very moderate and fixed rate of interest, viz., five or at the utmost six per cent.

Here, then, so far as the end to be attained is concerned, we seem to have set before us a perfectly legitimate ideal. But in order that it may be attained, it will, we are told, be necessary that the Trade Unions should so alter their present constitution and organization as to transform themselves into genuine industrial Guilds, which shall be capable of undertaking productive works on the largest scale, appointing, by means of an elaborate elective scheme, their own managers, overseers, and foremen, paying to these their respective salaries and the wages (though Mr. Cole would scorn the word) of the manual workers, and making their own provision

for insurance against unemployment, for sick pay, and the like. And it seems to me at least conceivable that, even supposing the present system to remain unaltered in other respects, such industrial Guilds, if only they could be brought into being, might become so powerful that the capitalist, whether individually or in combination, should have no means of getting work done except through their agency and on their terms.

Mr. Cole is of course far too shrewd not to see that the Unions, as they are at present organized and hampered by their existing rules, are by no means ripe for the undertaking of such a task as he would ultimately assign to them, that their unreadiness is by no means on the same level in the various leading industries, and that the methods to be pursued are not everywhere in all particulars the same. Speaking generally, however, the principal needs of labour organization, relatively to the end in view, are, as he adds, (1) a sweeping change, by way of amalgamation, from the existing or surviving system of "Craft" Unions, to that of more comprehensive "industrial" Unions, one for each industry; (2) the recognition of the "shop" (or factory) as the fundamental writ in each Union or Guild; and (3) a determined policy of "encroaching control," to be pursued concurrently with the carrying out of the internal changes which have been indicated.

With reference to these three points it may be useful to explain (1) that, at present, the workers in almost every industry (*e.g.*, engineering) are organized in a more or less considerable number of "Craft" Unions, each embracing only those who are engaged in particular processes or groups of processes; that consequently (2) any particular "Shop" or factory may number among its workers members of perhaps half a dozen "Craft" Unions, with the result that the whole system of "Shop Stewards" and "Shop Committees" normally cuts across the official organization of the Unions; and (3) that the policy of "encroaching control" loses much of the force which it would have if the workers in every "Shop" were members of a single Union.

Notwithstanding his conviction as to the unreadiness of by far the greater number of the Unions for the functions which he hopes that they will one day fulfil, Mr. Cole is sanguine as to the possibility and the importance of the speedy nationalization of the mines and of the railways, to be suc-

ceeded at no very long interval by that of the shipbuilding and shipping industries. The whole business of engineering, apart from that portion of the industry which is directly concerned with mines, railways, and ships, would come next, and then in due course the textile and building trades. If a beginning could be made with these, the rest, he is confident, would follow suit. Such is, in brief outline, Mr. Cole's scheme.

On two points the author expresses his conviction with somewhat vehement emphasis, viz., (1) that all such measures as the establishment of "Whitley Councils," and all schemes of profit-sharing and so-called "co-partnership" (*i.e.*, of the workers with the capitalist employer), are totally inadequate as measures of "reconstruction," and may even prove positively mischievous in so far as they tend to obstruct those more drastic methods and measures which are urgently needed; and (2) that it is futile to expect or imagine that productive industry on co-operative lines, at any rate on a large scale, can amicably co-exist with capitalist undertakings. On the first of these two contentions nothing need be here said. But on the second a word may be usefully added by way of illustration. Writing on the rapidity with which the process of de-control was carried out after the war, and of the sale of "national factories" to capitalist firms, Mr. Cole says:

Faced with the universal opposition of Labour to this policy of national surrender to "Big Business," the Government attempted certain evasions. For instance, it attempted to give a large and liberal appearance to the alienation of the national factories by throwing out the suggestion that some of them should be taken over by the Trade Unions. . . . But the suggestion as a whole was preposterous, as Sir Eric Geddes must well have known when he made it. For in the first place, some of the best factories had already been sold privately to capitalist firms, presumably under pledges given when they were first constructed. Secondly, what funds the Trade Unions have are subscribed for the provision of benefits, and cannot be used for investment in productive undertakings.¹ Thirdly, *a Trade Union*, even if it could establish the most efficient system of workshop management, *would stand no chance under the conditions imposed by the capitalist system of success in the competitive market.* It would

¹ True, but the Government can hardly be blamed on the ground that the Trade Unions were, by the articles of their constitution, incapable, for the present, of "taking on the job." The real force of the passage lies in what follows.

not only be systematically undersold, even at a loss: it would be held up, or blackmailed, for the raw materials, machinery, etc., which it would have to procure from other private firms. Even progressive employers in the engineering trades have sometimes found the difficulty of maintaining a low cost of production in face of the hostility of the big combines; and certainly these combines would spare no effort to crush out of existence a Trade Union competitor.¹

Once more then, his conclusion is, in substance, that the Trade Unions must so modify their constitutions and their whole organization as to be capable of "taking on," and carrying on, large-scale industry, and that when they are then ready, the capitalist must be, not indeed expropriated forthwith, but, as has been said, compulsorily bought out.

A quite fundamental feature in Mr. Cole's scheme is the proposed or rather the anticipated substitution of "the motive of service" for "the motive of gain or greed" on the part of the rich, and for "the motive of fear"—the fear of unemployment, destitution, submergence—on that of the workers, throughout the whole field of productive and distributive industry. Not as though such a substitution of motives could be effected as it were mechanically, like the substitution of oil for coal as the driving element in an engine. But, to state Mr. Cole's case, not precisely as he states it, but as it presents itself to me, it would seem that, whereas the primary motive with which the ordinary conscientious layman works is that of securing a "competence" for himself and his family, and whereas under present conditions the worker's energies are apt to be in some degree paralyzed by the reflection that he is not merely earning a competence, or less, for himself, but is also helping very rich men to become richer by swelling their exorbitant profits, there would be no such paralysis of energy if he were convinced that the "surplus" of his output would go in one form or other to the benefit either of the community at large or of his own class in particular. "The motive of service" would then become, not indeed (as Mr. Cole seems to imply) the *principal* driving force in industry, but a powerful secondary or subsidiary consideration. And this secondary or subsidiary consideration would be a valuable addition to the habitual but largely subconscious and wholly reasonable motive of fear, as above described. For it is, and always will be, perfectly reasonable that the pro-

¹ Pp. 31—32. Italics mine.

fessional man should be kept at his desk, no less than the worker at his bench, by the reflection that slackness or indolence will bring its own punishment. That the motive of service can be invoked with effect is a truth which may be illustrated, not only by countless instances of war-time patriotism, but also by the daily example of the millions of members of the (distributive) "Co-operative Movement," who are unquestionably encouraged by the thought that, beyond the fixed and very moderate rate of interest on the investments of shareholders, all the surplus arising out of their undertaking either returns to themselves in the form of rebates, or is expended on educational or other benevolent purposes.¹

Enough has perhaps been said to show that in Mr. Cole's programme of drastic reconstruction there is much that rightly claims our very cordial approval. We should all, it may be hoped, rejoice to see a movement in the direction of co-operative *production* taking place side by side with the steady development of co-operative *distribution* (the "Co-operative Movement" set on foot by "the Rochdale Pioneers" in 1844, and now happily flourishing), with this discriminating difference, that whereas the control of co-operative distribution is in the hands of the consumers, that of co-operative production would lie with the elected representatives of the producers, that is to say, of "the workers by hand and brain."

But we are very far indeed from being able to give an unqualified assent to Mr. Cole's forecast, or to his proposals in their entirety. Even on the supposition that the all but universal substitution of a complete system of co-operative production for the existing "capitalist system" were in itself desirable, as perhaps it is, it could, I think, be reasonably regarded only as the remotely possible result of a long process of industrial evolution. It could not be carried out within a brief space of years unless it were supported by the united forces of "Labour." And of such support there seems to be no immediate prospect. So long as the present organization of craft unions is maintained, the proposed change is manifestly impossible. And, unless I am much mistaken, the craft unions will long continue to have their champions, and the process of change into "industrial" unions must be slow. Nor, again, are the advantages of amalgamation

¹ I deliberately use the term "rebates," because what the co-operators call "dividends" are *not* "dividends" at all in the ordinary meaning of the term, but are a return to them of a percentage of the purchase money paid by themselves, individually, for goods supplied to them.

quite so evident as Mr. Cole considers them to be. It is at least conceivable that the tyranny of "Big Business" might prove to have found its successor in a tyranny of "Big Unions." Again, the reiterated exhortation addressed to the workers of the country to adopt a policy of "encroaching control" may, if it be acted upon, lead to a good deal of disillusionment and consequent bitterness, and a new kind of unrest. However democratic, in theory, the future organization of industry may be, the average worker will, after all, find himself in a position of very thorough subordination to his foreman, overseer, and manager, and his own personal share in "control" or management will be of the smallest. Nor again, human nature being what it is, can we be quite sure that the elected foremen and overseers, under a democratic scheme, will invariably prove to have been chosen with a single view to their efficiency. Moreover, in so far as the realization of a full-blown scheme, such as that which has been so clearly and persuasively set forth by Mr. Cole, would involve very extensive measures of compulsory purchase, it is well to remember that not only is downright and uncompensated expropriation morally unjust, but even compulsory purchase can rightfully be carried out only under three conditions. These are (1) that the evil to be remedied is real and grave; (2) that the considerable advantages to be expected from the proposed transfer are either certain or at least highly probable; and (3) that these advantages cannot be secured in a manner less disturbing to the existing order of things. Hence, if advice from such a quarter were likely to have any weight, it would, I think, be reasonable to counsel the advocates of co-operative production to "go slow," and to be content to start, like the Rochdale Pioneers, from small beginnings. Meanwhile, against the efforts for increased (or "encroaching") control in existing capitalistic industries, taken by themselves, and apart from the illusive hopes which they may encourage, I have no word to say, provided of course that, in the process, moral principles are not violated, as, for instance, by spiteful action, by disregard of voluntary agreements freely entered into, or by strikes of a kind that are likely to do more harm than good. It may be hoped that the time will come when, in view of the increased and wisely directed power of the reconstituted Unions, it may become possible for co-operative production, even on the largest scale, to be carried on without the fear of being boycotted or under-sold by capitalist rivals.

But what of the nationalization of the mines, the railways, and other transport services, and ultimately perhaps of the shipping and shipbuilding industries? It should, I think, be frankly recognized that in principle there is no difference at all between the nationalization of railways and the obviously legitimate municipalization of a tramway service. The question is one of expediency. And as to the expediency of nationalization in any or all of these departments, he would be a bold man who should venture to form an opinion without a careful study of all the factors of an exceedingly complex problem or set of problems. With these I am not here concerned, but only with the morality of a method of procedure which is at the present time loudly advocated, not indeed by Mr. Cole, but by a considerable section of the miners of the country. I mean, of course, the method of "direct action," that is to say, the calling of a more or less general strike in order to force the hands of Government. On this point I am only repeating what has been frequently said by some of the wiser among our Labour leaders, when I observe that *if* the great majority of the population is rightly or wrongly opposed to nationalization, *then* to attempt to carry the measure by the highhanded method of direct action is not only morally wrong, but is in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of democracy. It is to force on the majority of the people the will of a minority. It is to translate into deeds the false and subversive principle that "might is right." And more than this. Even if the majority were in favour of nationalization, the course that should be taken is not to inflict on the whole community the grievous injury involved in a general strike, but, at the next election, to return to Parliament members who should be pledged to vote for the desired measure.

In conclusion, believing, as I do, that Mr. Cole's ideal is, to say the least, incapable of speedy realization, I cannot but think that, in the meanwhile, those who have at heart the welfare of the workers of the country would do well to concentrate their efforts on legislation directed to the three-fold end of (1) limiting the amount or value of property which it shall be lawful for any individual to hold; (2) limiting the income which it shall be lawful for any individual to receive; (3) limiting the profits derivable from investments of whatsoever kind.

H. LUCAS.

THE CHRONICLES OF MR. H. G. WELLS

II.

ONE hardly expects from Mr. Wells the detail of a Froissart. The latter's voluminous chronicles cover barely eighty years, whereas whole milleniums are generously spanned in single parts of the *Outline*. This method of writing history has its disadvantages, since it involves looking at events through the wrong end of the telescope. It is, therefore, not surprising if Mr. Wells' ornate thumb-nail sketches occasionally bear little resemblance to the spacious scenes they purport to represent. This is a fault common to all bird's-eye views of history, but to it Mr. Wells adds a peculiar vice of his own. His history is purposive, designed to show "that men form one universal brotherhood, that they spring from one common origin, that their individual lives, their nations and races, interbreed and blend and go on to merge again at last in one common human destiny upon this little planet amidst the stars." Where the ordinary historian is content with classification, Mr. Wells, in the light of his guiding principle, insists on unification. His is a history for democrats by a democrat. No one is allowed to appear as unique in it. All great historic personages are speedily reduced to their least common denominator, and Athens, aristocrat of cities, is declared to have had "very much the atmosphere of the lower sort of contemporary music-hall." His study of religions is designed chiefly to show that the essential differences between Gautama, Confucius, Mahomed, and Christ, are really not worth writing about. Small wonder, then, if Mr. Wells applies the levelling-down process to Moses, David, and Solomon.

The story of "The Hebrew Scriptures and the Prophets" is told in fourteen teeming pages, to which Mr. Wells prefixes this significant note: "*The Encyclopædia Biblica* has been of great use here." This work, on which Mr. Wells relies so confidently, is advertised to-day by Messrs. Watts and Co. as "The Work for all Rationalists," and is offered, brand new, to all and sundry, for just half the price at which it was originally published. It is chiefly valuable as exemplifying the views held by the extreme left wing of biblical critics some twenty years ago. Yet this is the *font et origo*

of the study in the Scriptures with which Mr. Wells presents the masses. He is nothing if not versatile, and in the sixth part of his *History* he adopts quite the tone and style of the Higher Critic. For instance, he tells us that "There is much about the story of Moses that has a mythical flavour, and one of the most remarkable incidents in it, his concealment by his mother in an ark of bulrushes, has also been found in an ancient Sumerian inscription made at least a thousand years before his time by that Sargon I. who founded the ancient Akkadian-Sumerian Empire" (p. 164). Mr. Wells then gives a translation of the inscription, and rounds off the story with the comment, "This is perplexing." It is, but Mr. Wells himself has introduced the perplexity. Let us look at the known facts. The inscription quoted by Mr. Wells is not Sumerian at all. It occurs in an Omen-tablet, which is admitted by all experts to be Neo-Babylonian, and therefore certainly *after* the time of Moses. Canon Driver, for instance, in his commentary on Exodus (p. 12), assigns it to the eighth century B.C. But that is not all. Professor Leonard W. King, Assistant Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, and Professor of Assyrian and Babylonian Archæology in the University of London, has recently discovered the chronicle from which the inscription on the Omen-tablet was compiled. Writing in 1916, he says: "Finally, the recent discovery of a copy of the original chronicle, from which the historical references in the Omen-tablet were taken, restored the traditions to their true setting and freed them from the augural text into which they had been incorporated" (*A History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 220). Unfortunately for Mr. Wells, in all that is extant of this Semite (not Sumerian) chronicle, there is no mention whatsoever of the vital incident stressed by him—the story of Sargon's being abandoned by his mother to the river in a basket of reeds (*Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, by Professor L. W. King, Vol. I., pp. 27 ff.). So much for the facts. But the Higher Critic is frequently more concerned about theories than about facts, and gives us to understand that, though his facts may be wrong, his theories must be right. Now it is more particularly against Mr. Wells' theory and method that we wish to protest. Were the incident of Sargon's exposure exactly as set forth by Mr. Wells, it would nevertheless not be safe to conclude that the Hebrews must

have borrowed from the Babylonians. It is precisely this sort of unwarranted inference that has brought the study of comparative religion, as practised by the rationalist school, into disrepute. The comparative method has its uses, but, as Professor Rhys Davids remarks, it

will be of worse than no service if we imagine that likeness is any proof of direct relationship, that similarity of ideas in different countries shows that either the one or the other was necessarily a borrower. . . . It would of course be going too far to deny that coincidences of belief are occasionally produced by actual contact of mind with mind; but it is no more necessary to assume that they always are so, than to assume that chalk cliffs, if there be such, in China, are produced by chalk cliffs in the Downs of Sussex. They have no connection one with another, except that both are the result of similar causes. Yet this manner of reasoning is constantly found, not only through the whole range of the literature of the subject from classical times downwards, but even in the works of the present day.¹

It is the manner of reasoning adopted by Mr. Wells, not only with regard to the historical records of the Old Testament, but, as we shall see, even with regard to Christian origins.

The psychoanalyst would say that Mr. Wells must have suffered, as a boy, from an overdose of the righteousness of David and Solomon, so vigorously does he react at the mere mention of their names. They are the real villains of this *Outline*, and Mr. Wells exercises his author's privilege of abusing them roundly. He would be more convincing were he less reckless in the things he says about them. For instance, the finishing touches he adds to the picture of David as a scheming adventurer, are more artistic than accurate: "He married Michal, the daughter of Saul, but there was no love between them. The marriage was an attempt to legitimate his position. She hated and insulted him—he had hung her sons—and kept her a close captive (II Sam. vi.)" (p. 169). We can only surmise as to where Mr. Wells got all this information—he certainly did not get it from the Bible, which says: "And Michal, Saul's daughter, loved David" (I Sam. xviii. 20); and again, "Saul

¹ *The Origin and Growth of Religion*, as illustrated by some points in the history of Indian Buddhism (pp. 3, 4).

saw and knew that the Lord was with David, and that Michal, Saul's daughter, loved him" (I Sam. xviii., 28). But it is that parenthesis of Mr. Wells', "he had hung [hanged] her sons," which puzzles us most; for, according to the very chapter of the second book of Samuel cited by Mr. Wells, "Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child unto the day of her death." Furthermore, there is nothing whatever in that chapter, or in any other, as to David's keeping her a close captive. We know not to what private sources of information Mr. Wells may have had access, but statements so manifestly at variance with all historical record need some confirmation.

His estimate of the influence of the Babylonians on the Jews is thus briefly summarized: "The plain fact of the Bible narrative is that the Jews went to Babylon barbarians and came back civilized . . . they returned with most of their material for the Old Testament" (p. 173). One can only rub one's eyes and wonder if Mr. Wells has any idea of what is generally admitted to be pre-exilic in the Old Testament. The list of such writings is a fairly formidable one. In the Hexateuch, the Jahvist, and Elohist documents, the Deuteronomist, Josue, and the bulk of the legislative matter in the Pentateuch; Judges, Ruth, Jeremias, Samuel, and Kings; the Proto-Isaias, Amos, Osee, Micheas, Joel, Jonas, Nahun, and most of Sophonias; and in addition, three-quarters of the Book of Psalms and the Book of Proverbs, to say nothing of the Canticle of Canticles. Even supposing that some or all of these were re-edited after the exile, it is surely grotesque to represent the Hebrews as returning from Babylon with the bare materials for the Old Testament. That "some of the later books are frankly post-captivity compositions" (p. 173), hardly justifies Mr. Wells' wild flight of fancy about the rest. Nor is he any more accurate in describing the leading ideas of these books. He says: "There was the belief first of all that Jehovah was the greatest and most powerful of tribal gods, and then that he was a god above all other gods, and at last that he was the only true god" (p. 173). Very skilfully Mr. Wells manages to convey the idea that monotheism amongst the Jews was the product of evolution. We seem to detect faint echoes of Grant Allen: "The only people who ever invented a pure monotheism at first hand were the Jews. . . . It is the peculiar glory of Israel to have evolved God" (*The Evolution of the Idea of God*, p. 68). But where in the whole range of

the Old Testament is there the slightest evidence that the Jews, as a people, were ever anything but monotheists? The view that religion was at first monotheistic and degenerated into polytheism is still more widely held than any rival opinion, because, as Andrew Lang remarked, "it may be an old theory, but facts 'winna ding,' and are on the side of an old theory." Mr. Wells, with showman's gesture, represents the god of the Jews as a purely tribal or national deity, but the pre-exilic book of Amos represents Him, not only as the God who brought Israel out of the land of Egypt, but also as the God who brought the Philistines, the mortal enemies of the Jews, out of Caphtor, and the Syrians out of Kir (Amos ix. 7). Mr. Wells might have given us an explanatory footnote with regard to this passage, for on his theory it has urgent need of elucidation. Also we would like to know how, on his evolutionary hypothesis, he explains the fact that, though the Jews were so susceptible to Babylonian influence, they reacted against the religion of their masters in general culture. Here is a race of barbarians with a tribal god, who after sojourning for some 70 years in Babylon, absorbing culture at every pore, emerge, not astral polytheists like their masters, but confirmed monotheists. The evolution of monotheism in such circumstances seems to us a greater miracle than any that Mr. Wells rejects. Considering the psychology of the Jewish race, their intense nationalism, their marked conservatism—not to say obstinacy—even from a purely naturalistic standpoint, it is much more probable that the Jews came out of captivity pure monotheists for the exceedingly simple reason that they were pure monotheists when they entered it. This, too, is thoroughly in keeping with the portrait of the Jew given by Mr. Wells some two hundred pages further on: "He remained obstinately monotheistic; he would have none other gods but the one true God. In Rome, as in Jerusalem, he stood out manfully against the worship of any god-Cæsar. And to the best of his ability he held to his covenants with his God. No graven images could enter Jerusalem; even the Roman standards with their eagles had to stay outside" (p. 355). An impartial student would be led to suspect that what the Jew was in Rome and Jerusalem, he was also in Babylon, especially as his conservatism was no new trait in his character. In Exodus and Deuteronomy the Jews are described as a "stiff-necked people," and the psychologist has every reason to judge that, had they been

anything but monotheistic to begin with, they would, humanly speaking, have remained so to the end.

We will now pass on to "The Beginning, the Rise and the Divisions of Christianity" (Part 12), since Mr. Wells himself links up this part of his *Outline* with the history of the Hebrews (p. 353). Here we must confess to a feeling of disappointment that a man of Mr. Wells' undoubted ability should rest content with the tattered theory of the Pauline origin of Christianity: Paul gave to the "Nazarenes" the beginnings of a creed, the "Nazarene" himself was "the seed rather than the founder of Christianity" (p. 355). We had all this *ad nauseam* a quarter of a century ago. Mr. Wells has evidently not kept pace with the rationalist movement. Nowadays, the fact that Christ was a teacher with a definite creed to which He called upon all to subscribe is made the basis of a charge of intolerance against the "Nazarene." The mere fact that the commonest expression on the lips of Christ is "Amen, amen, I say unto you"—an expression occurring some seventy times in the Gospels—is in itself sufficient to dispose of the idea that Christ did not regard himself as a teacher and a founder. Mr. Wells seems to think that the religion of Christ is comprised in the Eight Beatitudes. He has forgotten that it was the same Christ who said "unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven"; "except you eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you"; and "if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." This fanciful theory of the Pauline origin of Christianity falls to pieces before the robust common sense of Mr. G. K. Chesterton, who says of Mr. Wells:

Thus he seems almost to revive the suggestion of Renan: that St. Paul founded the Church that was really obeyed too much, while Christ only imagined the religion that was never obeyed enough. This is the sort of thing that is consistent with everything except the facts. It might be the relation between a prophet and an apostle; but it was certainly not the relation between that prophet and that apostle. I could understand a man saying that the Paul of the Epistles was a bumptious, bad-tempered and meddlesome bishop, wanting too much to boss everything or speed up everything. But the same realistic approach will make it perfectly plain that he is certainly not a person professing to *found* anything. He has not the tone of

a law-giver even like Mahomet or Moses, far less like Christ. He first persecuted the Church of God; but there was a Church for him to persecute. Possibly he afterwards pestered the Church of God; but there was a Church for him to pester. He had not made it, and never for one instant did he really talk as if he had. On the other hand, I can understand a man, an atheist or any anti-religionist, saying that Christ was a myth, or was a maniac, or was a liar and deceiver of the people. But I cannot understand any man arguing from the Gospel accounts and denying that Christ *did* talk as if he was founding something. He did talk like a law-giver, like an origin; not like a man belonging to something, but one making something for other people to belong to. We may belong to it or not, we may believe a word of it or not, we may like it or tolerate it or not, but that is the critical fact about the records as they stand; he most certainly did, according to those records, speak as one having authority and not as the Scribes.—(*The New Witness*, July 16th, p. 209.)

It is Mr. Wells' desire for unification that leads him to adopt such a theory. He is determined to demonstrate that there is nothing unique about Christianity, and no theory is too absurd if it will only reduce Christ to the level of the founders of other "universal religions." Every bead must be made to fit the string on which Mr. Wells has determined to thread it.

One imagines that Dr. Bosanquet and Mr. Joseph would not be so anxious to banish the syllogism from our midst after a course of Mr. Wells' non-syllogistic reasoning. It allows of an easy and graceful transition from the possible to the actual order. "It may be that the early parts of the gospels are accretions," he tells us. He has a decided weakness for may-be's, which are generally presented with such a wealth of detail that the average reader comes to regard them as facts.¹ But as a distinguished rationalist has pointed out, "Anything which does not involve a positive contradiction in terms *may be*. *But may-be's are not honey bees!*" Also Mr. Wells needs reminding that things are not always what they seem. During the first two centuries of the Christian era, he says, "a considerable amount of a sort of theocrasia seems to have gone on between the Christian cult and the almost equally popular and widely-diffused Mithraic cult, and the cult of Serapis-Isis-Horus" (p. 368). This

¹ Mr. Belloc has cleverly emphasized this characteristic in the *Dublin Review*, April-May-June, "A Few Words with Mr. Wells."

seems so to Mr. Wells because of a few superficial similarities in the three cults. As we have pointed out, he is apparently quite convinced that similarity of any kind in religious rites is a proof of common origin. A wider acquaintance with the history of religions would make him a little chary of that principle. The vestiges of Mithraism which he discerns in Christianity are faint indeed. The substitution of Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath is one. It apparently has not occurred to Mr. Wells that this change was made by the Christians in honour of Christ's Resurrection, which took place on the first day of the week. Mithraic are "probably also those ideas and phrases so distinctive of certain sects to this day, about being 'washed in the blood' of Christ, and of Christ being a blood sacrifice. For we have to remember that a death by crucifixion is hardly a more bloody death than hanging: to speak of Jesus shedding His Blood for mankind is really a most inaccurate expression" (p. 368). Death by crucifixion, in the ordinary way, may not have been bloody, but Christ's death certainly was. One would imagine that Mr. Wells had never heard of the scourging at the pillar, the crowning with thorns, and the piercing of Christ's side with a lance. And what sense is there in looking to Mithraism for the origin of a phraseology which is manifestly a modification of that of the Old Testament? M. Clément, the greatest authority on the Taurobolium, long rejected the theory of which Mr. Wells now gives us a *réchauffé*, and showed that, so far from Christianity having adopted the ideas and phraseology of Mithraism, it was the other way about: "The Phrygian priests of the Great Mother opposed their feasts of the spring equinox to the Christian Easter, and attributed to the blood spilt in the Taurobolium the redeeming power of the Blood of the Lamb" (*Religions Orientales*, pp. xii., 87). Mr. Wells lays some emphasis on what he considers to be contributions of the Alexandrine cult to Christian thought and practice: "In the personality of Horus, who was at once the son of Serapis and identical with Serapis, it was natural for the Christians to find an illuminating analogue in their struggles with the Pauline mysteries. From that to the identification of Mary with Isis, and her elevation to a rank quasi-divine . . . was also a very natural step" (p. 368).

Now Isis herself has been identified with Minerva, Venus, Diana, Proserpina, Ceres, Juno, Bellona, Hecate, and Rhamnasia (*The Golden Ass*. xi. c. 5). Where is all this identifi-

cation going to end? Mr. Wells gives the reader to understand that it was the early Christians who identified Mary with Isis, whereas the "identification" is in reality sheer speculation on the part of modern theorists. From Apuleius we know how the highest attributes of every known deity were predicated of Isis, so that it is no difficult matter to find points of resemblance between her and the Queen of Heaven. The differences between the two—though far more striking, and far more significant, in view of the syncretism that went on in the cult of Isis—are calmly ignored by the upholders of identity. Isis, like Osiris, was originally a beast, and therefore retains the heifer's horns as a symbol of her primitive nature; she was wife to her own brother; her priests were healers, wizards, and exorcists; all manner of excesses were connected with her worship, and yet we are asked to believe that the early Christians confused her with the Mother of Jesus. There is hardly a pagan goddess with whom Mary has not been at one time or another "identified," and in selecting Isis, Mr. Wells is somewhat out of date. If he wants to keep abreast of "modern thought," he must identify Mary with Virgo of the Zodiac!

The *reductio ad absurdum* of this kind of thing has been reached by an advanced scholar (Jeremias in his *Babylonisches*, p. 35), who "appeals, in support of his contention, to the representation on the side-door of Notre Dame in Paris, where (he says) Virgo is omitted among the signs of the Zodiac because she is identified with Mary!" (*Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, by Professor Carl Clemen, translated by Robert E. Nisbet, p. 304). The analogue alluded to by Mr. Wells is very far from "illuminating." Salomon Reinach speaks of the "inextricable confusion" of Egyptian mythology (*Orpheus*, p. 27), and adds: "Hieroglyphic inscriptions and papyri reveal the details of the ritual, more especially that of the dead; but the myths of the gods elude us for the most part, and the only one familiar to us, that of Osiris, was preserved by a Greek author" (*ibid.* p. 31). It is in this elusive mythology that Mr. Wells seeks for Christian origins. As for Serapis, he was a Græco-Asiatic deity, analogous to Pluto and identified with Osiris, who was introduced by the Ptolemies to Alexandria at the beginning of the Hellenic domination. In what sense his son Horus was "identical with Serapis," Mr. Wells unfortunately does not explain, and we are at a loss to dis-

cover. He has, in fact, merely revived the comparative method of Pfeiderer, which is thus commented on in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*: "The comparisons which Pfeiderer so industriously makes exaggerate the resemblances and ignore the differences between Christian ideas and the myths and legends of other religions, besides making the curious assumption that, if any similarity, however remote, can be suggested between a myth or legend and what claims to be a fact of Christian history, the fact cannot be a fact, but must be a fiction" (Vol. III. p. 582, col. 2). It will be found, on investigation, that the parallels cited by Mr. Wells are of the vaguest description. Far closer parallels are not regarded as indicating the kind of religious exchange which Mr. Wells seems to think must have taken place. To take an instance: "The Greeks," says Reinach, "were struck by the similarity of the legend of Osiris and that of Dionysos Zagreus, the young bull devoured by the Titans, to which Zeus granted a new and glorious life. These legends, both based upon sacrificial rites, coincide without having presumably borrowed one from another" (*Orpheus*, p. 31). The kind of thing that passed muster when Pfeiderer wrote his *Early Christian Concept of Christ*, will not pass muster now—there must be at least some evidence of the *borrowing*. For the theory of loan-gods, once so popular with anthropologists, is pretty generally recognized as being beset with many pitfalls for the unwary. Yet Mr. Wells must find origins somewhere other than in the Gospels, which he thus rules out of court: "Now it is a matter of fact that in the Gospels all that body of theological assertion which constitutes Christianity finds little support" (p. 358). It seems to us that this is rather a matter of prejudice, and is the cause of Mr. Wells' excursions from the field of fact into the more congenial realm of myth. One becomes a little doubtful of Mr. Wells' matters of fact when we find him calmly recording that "the Sabellians taught practically that there were three equal Gods, God the Father, God the Son (with whom Jesus was identified), and God the Holy Ghost" (p. 370). This is a little hard on the Sabellians, seeing that they went astray with regard to the Persons of the Trinity through over-emphasizing the unity of God, and protested vigorously against the current Platonic speculation about the Trinity lest it should foster the notion that there was a plurality of Gods ("*ne videantur deos dicere*," Origen, "on Titus,"

frag. II.). Mr. Wells' account of the Sabellians is hardly calculated to inspire confidence in his handling of matters theological.

Nor is he any more at home in the history of philosophy. Writing of the mediæval period, he says: "It may not surprise the reader to learn that the philosophy of the Catholic Church was essentially a Realist philosophy" (p. 510). This, however, surprises not only the reader, but also Professor Bury, who appends this footnote to Mr. Wells' text: "Nor is it true that Realism was the philosophy of the Church. It was, in the early Middle Ages; but, after Occam (1330), Nominalism triumphed, and was the philosophy of the Church till the Reformation. Luther denounced Nominalism" (p. 510). The plain fact of the matter is that the "Church" never had a "philosophy" as such. Followers of Occam did not constitute the Church, and the most celebrated of them, Buridan, Rector of Paris, was prohibited from teaching and condemned. With equal justice, the views of opponents of Occam, such as Thomas of Strasbourg and Raymond of Sabunde, might be described as the philosophy of the Church. In any case, Occam's Nominalism was not as Mr. Wells conceives it, but the niceties of the matter perhaps do not appeal to him. Occam, however, is best described as "a conceptualist who uses the language of Nominalism"—a Terminist who held that the term, as it exists *mentally* (not in speech or in writing), is alone universal. Mr. Wells' account of Nominalism is somewhat rough and ready, but his account of Realism is misleading. Thus, "the Realist outdid the vulgar tendency to exaggerate the significance of class" (p. 509). "Class" is a word which conveys a totally false impression when used in connection with Scholasticism. It connotes a definitely positivist outlook which, however familiar to Mr. Wells, was not that of the Realists. The Scholastics held species to be "natural," not a congeries of phenomena by the similarity of which "class" is formed. The point is important, and Mr. Wells is entirely unaware of it, with the result that his home-made illustrations of the Scholastic Realist doctrine are little better than literary libels. A word of protest against this sort of thing seems called for when Mr. Wells gives his readers to understand that his absurd caricature represents what was, at any time, the philosophy of the Catholic Church. Though Mr. Wells protests against the modern fashion of decrying the philosophical discussion

of the mediæval "schoolmen" as tedious and futile, he adds: "It had to assume a severely technical form because the dignitaries of the Church, ignorant and intolerant, were on the watch for heresy" (p. 508). Unfortunately for this ingenious theory that "technical form" existed before there were any dignitaries of the Church—it owes its origin to Aristotle, and was adopted in the schools because of its excellence as a didactic method. Leibnitz presumably was not engaged in a heresy-hunt when he wrote to Wagner:

I am persuaded that if we acted oftener so, if we sent one another syllogisms and prosyllogisms with the replies in form, we could very often, in the most important scientific questions, get at the bottom of things, and dispel a great many imaginations and dreams. By the very nature of the procedure we should cut short repetitions, exaggerations, digressions, incomplete expositions, voluntary or involuntary omissions, mistakes of order, misunderstandings, and all the annoying results that follow from these things.¹

It is just possible that the "schoolmen" thought so too. However, an account of the "schoolmen," in which there is one passing allusion to St. Thomas Aquinas, need not be taken too seriously.

Mr. Wells is not a sympathetic chronicler of the crusades. To him as a Humanitarian they are merely foolish expeditions resulting in great loss of human life, interesting only in so far as the "will to crusade" may be regarded as the germ of the "will to power." And so they are merely an illustration of how out of evil cometh good. Contrary to the intention of those who promoted them, the crusades helped to democratize Europe, since, according to Mr. Wells, the crusaders naturally returned from the East with a lessened regard for Papal authority, and are therefore to be hailed as heralds of revolt. It is perhaps too much to expect a man of Mr. Wells' temperament to show any real understanding of the chivalrous spirit of the crusaders, but one would have thought that a man of his vision would have seen in these much abused crusades prime factors in the advancement of civilization. Guizot long ago pointed out how much Europe owed to the Greek and Saracenic civilizations, with which the crusaders were brought into contact. The mere linking-up of East and West, and the inter-communication in literature, art, and commerce, brought about by the crusades, ought to be

¹ Quoted by Cardinal Mercier in his *Logique*, p. 171.

sufficient pragmatic justification even for Mr. Wells. How enthusiastically he would have written of the beneficent effects of these same crusades had they not been under the ægis of the Church of Rome! In one of his novels he makes his hero speak of the priests of the Catholic Church as men with faces averted from the dawn and feet set backwards. Mr. Wells believes this. It is a cardinal article of his creed, and much of his history is understandable only as a subscription to it. In this *Outline* the Catholic Church is always the clog on the wheel of progress. Thus: "Men of faith and wisdom believe in growth and their fellow-men; but priests, even such priests as Gregory VII., believe in the false 'efficiency' of an imposed discipline" (p. 462). An historian who can write thus of the Hildebrand whom Dean Milman bids us regard with awe as a benefactor of mankind, has indeed let his prejudice against priests run away with him. But it is perhaps only what might be expected from one who is convinced that "Rome has always had too much of the shrewdness of the priest and too little of the power of the prophet" (p. 461). As Mr. Wells assures us that every chapter of his *History* has been submitted to an expert, we cannot help wondering who was the expert who passed the following: "The Pope might in many instances set aside the laws of the Church in individual cases; he might allow cousins to marry, permit a man to have two wives, or release anyone from a vow" (p. 462). Mr. Wells apparently belongs to the same school of thought as the boy who declared that during an interdict the Pope forbids all births, deaths, and marriages for a year. Some expert might have explained to Mr. Wells that there are laws and laws, and that even the Pope cannot dispense from the natural, or from the divine positive, law. Possibly Mr. Wells has in mind some case in which a man, after his marriage has been declared null *ab initio*, has contracted a valid marriage whilst his first "wife" was alive. Such cases are contemplated in every modern code of civil law, and the charge of permitting polygamy, which Mr. Wells brings against the Church, might just as reasonably be levelled at the British Constitution.

By the time his chronicles reach the thirteenth century, Mr. Wells is already surveying the ruins of the Church of Rome: "It now behoves us to attempt a diagnosis of the failure of the Roman Church to secure and organize the good will of mankind" (p. 464). That supposed failure he attributes to the

fact that the Church "had become dogmatic." Such passages as the following about Popes and Cardinals are not in the best possible taste: "And it was just because many of them probably doubted secretly of the entire soundness of their vast and elaborate doctrinal fabric, that they would brook no discussion of it. They were intolerant of questions or dissent; not because they were sure of their faith, but because they were not" (p. 465). Such imputations of bad faith are more easily made than substantiated, and befit the mud-slinging controversialist rather than the impartial historian. Because we respect his honesty of purpose we regret that Mr. Wells has soiled his hands with such weapons. That he is doing his best to be fair to the historic Church we have no doubt. But fair he cannot be—he is psychologically unfitted for the task of Church historian. His disqualification lies precisely in the fact that he is himself a religious reformer zealously propagating a new evangel. With much suffering of soul he has risen from arid agnosticism to a shadowy theism, and found a faith—a faith in a "younger god," struggling and groping to find himself. In the service of that god Mr. Wells has become the Prophet of Progress, preaching that nothing is, was, or ever can be final. Like Nietzsche, he has set out to blaze a new path—into the future and backwards across the ages. Under the spell of his message, facts are moulded to fit theory, and his history becomes little better than a novel with a purpose—a thrilling story designed to show that the new faith is higher and nobler than the old.

(To be continued.)

RICHARD DOWNEY.

INTIMATES

DEATH wears a veiled face
 To strangers whom she meets;
 Her form is terror in the streets.
 But for her intimates,
 Who use with frequent feet
 The threshold of her house,
 And know her gates,
 She lifts with special grace
 The veil above her brows,
 Showing a visage homely sweet;
 And floods them with the light from those deep eyes,
 Portals of Paradise.

M. ST. JEROME.

THE TITUS OATES NEWSPAPER PRESS

IT is not generally known that the newspapers published in support of those who originated, or carried on, the "Popish Plot"—Shaftesbury, Titus Oates, and the rest—were very numerous; and, indeed, even those who are aware that there is a collection of them at the British Museum cannot very well obtain an adequate knowledge of them unless they inspect the whole of the volumes of the Burney collection from 1679 to 1683. The MS. catalogue is not a good guide, though to all intents and purposes it is the only one available.

In the "History of England" of that brilliant but inaccurate writer, Macaulay, there is a short reference to these papers. Macaulay asserts that:

While the Whig party was still formidable the Government thought it expedient to connive at the violation of this rule [that no man, not authorized by the Crown, had the right to publish political news]. During the great battle of the Exclusion Bill many newspapers were suffered to appear, the "Protestant Intelligence," the "Current Intelligence," the "Domestic Intelligence," the "True News," the "London Mercury,"

adding, in a footnote: "There is a very curious and, I should think, unique collection of these papers in the British Museum."

Macaulay then concludes that:

After the defeat of the Whigs it was no longer necessary for the King to be sparing in the use of that which all the judges had pronounced to be his undoubted prerogative. At the close of his reign no newspaper was suffered to appear without his allowance, and his allowance was given exclusively to the London Gazette.

As usual, this Whig historian is wrong. The Government did not connive at the Titus Oates press; they were powerless to suppress the papers up to 1682, and the "London Gazette" was not the only paper authorized. Sir Roger L'Estrange's "Observer" was licensed throughout and lasted up to March 9, 1687. (No. 1, April 13, 1681.)

The Titus Oates Press was set on foot soon after the "Printing Act" of 1662 expired, in May, 1679. I use the term "Printing Act" advisedly, for there never was such a thing as a "Licensing Act," and licensing had always been carried out under the Royal prerogative. What the "Printing Act" did was to regulate printing and restrict the number of presses—not set up a board of licensers. By refusing to renew this Act in 1679, the Parliament intentionally opened the door to seditious and dishonest printers. It may have been advisable to remove the shackles from the printing press, but to do so at such a juncture was to defy the King and to court a catastrophe.

Thus, with very few exceptions, the Titus Oates papers contains the publishers' imprints, and it is by these imprints that they should be judged, rather than by their titles, for their publishers also printed the Tracts of the Times, and a good many prosecutions were the result.

"Domestick Intelligence; or, News from both City and Country. Published to prevent false reports" (!), No. 1 of which appeared on July 7, 1679, was first in the field, and was issued by Benjamin Harris,¹ an anabaptist and supporter of Oates. This lasted, with intervals of suppression, until 1681, when, as the "Protestant Domestick Intelligence," it was finally crushed in April.

Harris soon found an opponent in Nathaniel Thompson, called "Popish Nat" (whether he was a Catholic or not is a matter of doubt), who commenced another "Domestick Intelligence" on August 26, 1679, terming his first number "No. 15." Harris had no remedy at law for this piracy, for his own paper was illegal, and the maxim runs: "In pari delicto potior est conditio defendentis." By May, 1680, twenty-two other papers of long or short duration followed, so that the King took the advice of his judges, who decided that it was illegal to print news without permission. Their unanimous opinion was published in the "London Gazette" for May 3 to 6, 1680, and was followed by a Royal Proclamation against the papers. It will be seen, therefore, that Macaulay muddled his dates.

The Proclamation was only partially successful at first, for City juries would not convict, and we thus ascertain one of the reasons for the rescission of the City Charter. Up to 1682,

¹ Some account of Harris's later exploits was given in the present writer's paper in this Review for Sept. 1919, entitled "Dean Swift and John Partridge."

by which time they were all stamped out, about fifteen more papers can be mentioned, thanks to the revival of the plot in 1680, and the Government was powerless because unable to obtain a conviction.

Anyone who reads the papers themselves, and also that valuable record of prosecutions—the late W. H. Hart's "*Index Expurgatorius Anglicanus*"—will realize the extent and danger of the Whig plots at this time, nor can the wickedness and malice of the famous "Appeal from the Country to the City," published by Benjamin Harris in 1680, be over-estimated. The writer (Charles Blount, the Deist, who later on committed suicide) invites his readers to survey London from the Monument:

First imagine you see the whole town in flames, occasioned a second time by the same Popish malice which set it on fire before. At the same instant fancy that amongst the distracted crowd you behold troops of Papists ravishing your wives and daughters, dashing your little children's brains out against the walls, plundering your houses and cutting your own throats, by the name of "heretic dogs." Then represent to yourself the tower playing off its cannon and battering down the houses about your ears. Also, casting your eye towards Smithfield, imagine you see your father or mother, or some of your nearest relations, tied to the stake in the midst of flames; when with hands and eyes lifted up to Heaven they scream and cry out to that God for whose cause they die; which was a frequent spectacle the last time Popery reigned among us. Fancy you behold those beautiful churches, erected for the true worship of God, abused and turned into idolatrous temples, to the dishonour of Christ and scandal of religion; the ministers of God's Holy Word torn to pieces before your eyes and their best friends not daring to speak in their behalf. The only objects will be women running with their hair about their ears, men covered with blood, and children sprawling under horses feet, and only the walls of houses left standing. When those that survive this fatal day may sigh and cry, "Here once stood my house, there my friends and here my kinsmen—but, alas, that time is past." The only noise will then be, "O my wife!" "O my husband!" "O my dearest children!" In fine, what the Devil himself would do, were he here upon Earth, will in his absence infallibly be acted by his agents the Papists. Those who had the ingratitude and baseness to attempt the life of a Prince so indulgent to them will hardly be less cruel to any of his Protestant subjects.¹

¹ See Hart's "*Index Expurgatorius Anglicanus*," p. 206, for the prosecution of Harris. There were two editions of this tract—the first dated 1679 (*i.e.* 1679/80), and the second 1680 (*i.e.* after March 25, 1680).

The cunning of the appeal to the genuine loyalists in the last sentences can hardly be surpassed, and in order to prevent the horrors he foretold the writer advocated the claims of the Duke of Monmouth. "Remember the old rule," wrote he. "He who hath the worst title ever makes the best King."

The first victim of the "Appeal," aided by the Titus Oates press, was Lord Stafford. The last was the Blessed Archbishop Plunket, though here the main factor was Bishop Henry Jones, formerly Scout-Master-General to Cromwell, and prime compiler of the "depositions" about the Irish Rebellion of 1641.

Nathaniel Thompson, encouraged perhaps by the authorities, again entered the lists against Harris and the others by publishing the "Loyal Protestant and True Domestic Intelligence" (Nos. 1—127. 9 March 1680/81 to 20 March 1682/83). And a more formidable opponent arose in the person of Sir Roger L'Estrange, with his "Observator." A third paper, "Heraclitus Ridens," written by Thomas Flatman, commenced on February 1, 1681, but was mainly satirical.

Sir Roger L'Estrange has, in recent years, been the subject of an elaborate biography by Mr. Kitchen, who has throughout carried out the attack commenced upon the famous old Tory pamphleteer by the late Professor Masson, in his life of Milton. As a result, no fact stated by Mr. Kitchen can be accepted without question. His history of the press and press laws is worse than untrue; it is absurd, and the sole merit of his book lies in the literary judgments, which are excellent. Mr. Kitchen is not an historian, but a literary critic. But Sir Roger, with all his faults, was a loyal and honourable gentleman, incapable of the meanness attributed to him by Masson and Mr. Kitchen. His one great achievement was the tracking down of Oates and his accomplices, and for this service he will always be remembered with gratitude by Catholics. His "Observators" are very difficult to read, but the reader who succeeds in mastering them will acquire a complete knowledge, from the Tory side it is true, of the whole of the plots of the reign of Charles II. and of most of the pamphlet literature of the times.

On the other side, the main lines of Shaftesbury's plots can be traced in the papers issued by Benjamin Harris and by Francis Smith (whose biography was given in the "Times Printing Number" of 1912). Nor should the papers issued

by Langley Curtiss be neglected. The advertisements of the pamphlets and books of the times, to be found in these last three publishers' papers, are of considerable importance, if only because contemporary catalogues, professing to be exhaustive, are really nothing of the kind. They only notice those which attracted more than ordinary attention, or were the subject of prosecutions, and omit large numbers which their compilers had not seen.

According to the historian, Echard, whose knowledge of the newspapers and pamphlets of the period of Oates' plot has never received due recognition, the Titus Oates press was suppressed after the loyal "Addresses" presented to the King—just before Shaftesbury's trial:

As these Addresses prevailed [says Echard] all the contrary News Papers, call'd "Domestick Intelligence" &c. (there were three or four distinct publications with this title) and Weekly [News] Printed for Francis Smith, Benjamin Harris and Langley Curtis, were by order of Council, as was reported, put down and silenced. And the fore mentioned Francis Smith, called "Elephant Smith" [from his sign of the "Elephant and Castle"—in contradistinction to John Smith] the most publick vendor of such papers, was committed to Newgate.

Finally, at the suggestion of Charles II. himself, Dryden wrote and published his satire of Absalom and Achitophel in November, 1681. Aimed at Shaftesbury, and published anonymously, Echard tells us that this satire from the first attracted much attention. It marked the close of a press campaign, the like of which, it is hoped, will never be seen in England again.

J. B. WILLIAMS.

LIMPIAS AND THE PROBLEM OF COLLECTIVE HALLUCINATION

II.

IT will readily be understood that in the case of such manifestations as those we are considering any sort of official inquiry is of value, if only from the fact that the depositions are then made with a certain formality and under sanction of an oath. For this reason it is worth while to enter into some detail regarding the Madonna of Rimini, which in 1850 was the occasion of phenomena precisely analogous to those previously described which occurred at Rome in 1796. A picture of the "Mother of Mercy," exposed for veneration in the church of Santa Clara at Rimini, was observed, on May 11, 1850, to move its eyes. The first persons to witness the marvel were the Countess Baldini, her adopted daughter, and another young lady who was praying before this Madonna in her company. The Countess declared that, when kneeling in front of the little altar over which the picture was suspended, she saw the pupils of the eyes move upwards under the upper lids until they completely disappeared from view, leaving visible only the whites. The two girls were a little further off, but on being told of what had happened, they came and stood on the step of the altar watching the picture, which was then almost within reach of their hands. In a few minutes all three simultaneously saw the movement repeated, and in the course of half an hour the same thing happened several times. Next day the two girls returned, and in their presence several other women and a priest had a similar experience. The news spread, the church was visited by hundreds, and soon after by thousands. That the picture might be more conveniently seen it was transferred to the high altar, and the glass which protected the canvas was removed. Finally, as the crowds increased, the Bishop ordered that it should be carried processionally to one of the biggest churches of the city, St. Augustine's, and deposited there, while a ten days mission was given by a band of religious preachers. The procession was a triumphal progress. A halt was made in the principal square of Rimini, and while, in broad daylight, the Bishop of Faenza blessed the

people with the picture, the eyes of the Madonna, as was subsequently attested on oath by several witnesses, were again observed to move.

The Bishop of Rimini soon after appointed a commission, consisting of ecclesiastics and laymen of position, to inquire into the facts. They received the depositions of one hundred eye-witnesses of the alleged prodigy, and then made their report, apparently considering it useless to prolong the investigation further. The witnesses included a Cardinal, three Bishops, and a number of distinguished ecclesiastics, as well as some twenty members of the nobility, both men and women, together with lawyers, artists, doctors, and artisans. Of the whole number of those who gave evidence more than two-thirds were men. On January 11, 1851, the Bishop of the Diocese, acting upon this report, published a decree, declaring that "the truth of the prodigious movement of the eyes in the picture of the Mother of Mercy has been proved," and may be treated as a well-established historical fact. Some little time later, a well-arranged summary of the evidence was printed with full official sanction. Although I have been unable to meet with a copy of the original Italian, I have before me a French translation, published at Paris in the same year.¹ There can be no reason to doubt its accuracy. It is from this source, confirmed, however, by other contemporary descriptions,² that the account here given is derived.

Cardinal Ciacchi, then 62 years old, declared on oath that on May 25th he observed, seven or eight times over, a vertical movement in the left eye of the picture, and he adds: "I believe that on one occasion I noticed a similar movement of the right eye, but I do not feel so sure of it as to be able to swear to the fact." Mgr. Pironi, the Governor of Urbino, in his statement, declares that he saw "the two pupils come to life, so to speak, and while still directed heavenwards, move gently from left to right, and *vice versa*, with an expression I cannot convey in words." Mgr. Gentili, Bishop of Pesaro, climbed up on to the table of the altar in order to be able to study the picture the better. He was short-sighted, and from the floor the previous evening, amid the glare of the candles, he had been unable to see anything, but now it was broad daylight and an hour after midday—

¹ *Relation de l'Événement miraculeux de la Madone de Rimini, extraite du Procès authentique dressé par l'autorité ecclésiastique du Diocèse*; Paris, 1852.

² *The Rambler*, Vol. VI. Aug. and Sept. 1850, pp. 177 and 277. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1st Series, Vol. I. pp. 690 seq.; and Vol. IX. p. 556.

While I was in this position [he says] five minutes or more passed without my being deemed worthy to perceive any change in the sacred eyes, although the faithful, crowded below, testified by the ardent piety of their exclamations that they saw more than I did. Accordingly I addressed an earnest prayer to Our Lady, begging her . . . that I might witness, if only once, this evidence of her sovereign power. At that moment—and the tears fill my eyes as I recall it—I saw the sacred pupils gleam as they passed from left to right and back again, and then I perceived that the left pupil turned upwards towards the eyelid so far that it was almost entirely hidden, and left only the opaque white of the cornea in its place. My emotion was something I cannot describe. A flood of tears burst from my eyes and I trembled so violently in all my limbs that I was compelled to descend with the aid of two priests standing by.

The Bishop further declares that he came back a second time with a great pilgrimage from his own diocese, but that though he spent long hours before the same picture of the Madonna, making acts of thanksgiving and tender devotion, he "never saw anything more, save with the eye of faith."

The experience of the Bishop of Cesena, who also witnessed the prodigy, differs in some respects from most of the other records. He saw the Madonna raise her eyes with an expression of great joy and sweetness, and "then suddenly lower them and turn them upon me for a moment with so tender a look that I could not keep back my tears." He was kneeling at the time upon the steps of the altar immediately below the picture. Not less remarkable is the detailed account of Canon Canzi of Bologna. On four different occasions he visited the church, but although he was more than once in the best position for seeing, and quite close to the picture, and though at another time he used two different pairs of opera glasses, he had been unable to observe any movement in a way that satisfied him. Finally, he borrowed an excellent pair of binoculars, which enabled him, even from some distance, "to trace the threads of the canvas and to distinguish slight patches of dust which lay here and there upon the surface of the picture." "I could see as well," he adds, "as if the painting were no more than a foot away from me." Under these circumstances, after a few minutes waiting, he perceived an unmistakable movement of the eyes, frequently repeated, and both on this and on another subsequent occasion, getting into conversation with one or two persons in his neighbourhood, he satisfied himself that their impressions exactly syn-

chronized with his regarding the moment, nature, and duration of the movements. Finally, one of the most graphic depositions is that of the Very Rev. Joseph Pini, the parish priest of San Gregorio at Bologna. He perceived the changes in the direction of the eyes after he had been in the church for a few minutes on his first visit, but being of a sceptical temperament, he wanted fuller assurance. As it happened that the picture was left for a while merely standing on the altar, he was allowed to touch it, examine it, and satisfy himself that no mechanical contrivance could possibly have been employed to produce the prodigy. He blocked the way so long that the crowd grew impatient, and began to make audible comments. "That priest doesn't seem to believe," they said. When at last he had drawn a little aside, voices soon after began to be heard, "See, they are moving!"

For my own part [he goes on] I was convinced that nothing of the sort had happened, so turning in the direction from which these words came, I could not help saying aloud: "No, no; we must not delude ourselves. That would do no pleasure to Our Lady. Certainly at this moment there is no movement." On this the cries ceased. Oh! how my doubts redoubled! Who knows, I said to myself, if I have not so far been quite mistaken in what I thought I saw? Who knows if it is not all pure imagination?—then, suddenly, after a moment's interval, I saw with the utmost possible clearness the two pupils directed towards Heaven, and almost entirely disappearing under the eyelids, until only a tiny rim of black could be discerned, while the white expanded and filled a larger space.¹

All the experiences hitherto mentioned took place in May, or at latest in June, of the year 1850. Six months later, however, when the manifestations had almost ceased, and when the picture had been taken back to the little church of Santa Clara, a curious test was applied by seven devout persons, of whom three were priests, who decided to watch the entire night between the 9th and 10th of December, in the presence of the Madonna in question. With the permission of the Religious to whom the church belonged, the priest, Don Marco Mathini, inserting two needles between the frame of the picture and the canvas, stretched a white thread horizontally from one to the other, in such a way that it exactly marked the lower extremity of the two pupils, becoming, in fact, a tangent to the two dark orbs which the artist had

¹ For all these see *Relation*, pp. 89—104.

painted. The purpose of the watchers was mainly devotional, and they spent the time in reciting in common certain prayers, including a paraphrase of the *Salve Regina*. At the words, "Turn those merciful eyes of thine upon us," the pupils of the Madonna were observed very plainly to move and to continue in movement for some time. One after another, the watchers climbed on to the table of the altar before the picture, and from there, at the distance of only a few feet, they were able to observe that the clearly-marked triangles, bounded by the thread, the pupil and the upper eyebrow, alternately grew and diminished as the eyes moved horizontally, while, as the eyes were raised vertically, a notable space was left between the thread and the lower rim of the pupil. In the *Relation*, already referred to, the actual words used in the depositions of four of these witnesses are quoted. There was, they tell us, a good light, provided by the candles which were burning on either side of the picture. It is curious and somewhat inexplicable that, as in the testimony already quoted of Cardinal Ciacchi, the phenomenon seems to have been much more readily perceptible in the left eye of the Madonna. For example, Giovanni Lanfranconi, who states that he did not at first observe these manifestations, because he was kneeling behind, and the others got between him and the picture, continues thus:

But when they had shifted their position a little, and I in my turn climbed on to the table of the altar, I saw very clearly the pupil of the left eye, which just grazed the thread, separate from it and rise until it completely disappeared under the upper eyebrow, leaving a white space above the thread; which space afterwards vanished as the pupil slowly descended and returned to its normal position with which the thread was in contact.¹

The whole matter is very puzzling. Expectant attention under such conditions may fairly be supposed to have exercised its maximum effect. But the difficulty in that case is to understand why, for some observers, the left eye should apparently alone have exhibited the phenomenon which was looked for. Meanwhile, certain points seem to be definitely established. No one, I think, who reads the *Relation*, can doubt the absolute good faith of the vast majority of the witnesses; they were quite convinced they saw the eyes move. Secondly, this impression cannot be explained by any optical

¹ *Relation*, pp. 54-60.

illusion caused by the circumstances of the lighting of the picture. The supposed movements were seen under conditions which were endlessly varied, *e.g.*, in a side chapel at Santa Clara, then at the high altar at Santa Clara, then in the principal square of the city, then at St. Augustine's, where for several months the picture was exhibited in many different positions, sometimes high up and at other times resting on the table of the altar. The same phenomena were observed both by daylight and when the picture was illuminated by a blaze of candles on either side. On the other hand, it is worthy of note that the episcopal decree of approbation confines itself to attesting the simple movement of the eyes, despite the fact that some of the witnesses professed to have perceived other manifestations. In quite curious accord with the experience of many recent pilgrims to Limpias, a certain small proportion of the witnesses at Rimini, some thirteen in all, but including several priests occupying responsible positions, and also the Marchioness Buonadrata Borghesi, deposed to having observed the face of the Madonna change colour. For example, Canon Perrelli, of Ancona, states: "I also observed, and I am sure I am not mistaken, that this sacred picture changed colour; for I noticed that it showed itself successively pale and rosy of hue, though the light was the same."¹ Similarly, and once more in accord with the accounts of the Limpias prodigy, two (but only two) of the depositions mention a movement of the lips. For example, the Capuchin, Father Constantino, declares:

I saw that the picture opened its lips, though but slightly. Fearing that my first impression was deceptive, I watched more closely, but the movement only appeared to me more pronounced, for I saw the chin fall with the lower lip, and then gradually return to its place.²

At Limpias, it will be remembered, some few of the spectators perceive drops of blood which trickle down from the eye, cross the cheek, and then disappear. At Rimini, in 1850, there was, of course, nothing in the picture of the Madonna to suggest blood. But what are we to make of the following statements occurring in the *Relation*?

Father Constantino, the Capuchin, towards the end of his interrogatory, expresses himself thus: "I confirm all that I have

¹ *Relation*, pp. 61-62.

² *Relation*, p. 63.

said, but I have one other remarkable circumstance to add: it is that at St. Augustine's I twice saw a tear start from the right eye of the picture of the holy Virgin." The same thing was noticed on three different occasions by his brother in religion, Father Odoardo de Forlì; for he also deposes that he saw a tear fall from the right eye and disappear from view when it had crossed the cheek half-way. This was furthermore reported by Messrs. Pietro della Santa and Domenico Vanucci. Both of them mention this detail in their interrogatory and attest the fact under oath.¹

Finally, the circumstance must not be ignored that, just as at Rome in 1796, so at Rimini in 1850, when movements of the eyes had been detected in one Madonna, the same phenomenon began to be observed in other Madonnas, especially in those belonging to the surrounding tract of country. From a statement printed in *The Rambler* for September, 1850, we learn that "the same prodigy takes place at Fossombrone, at Lugo, at Sant' Arcangelo, at Sant' Agata, and at Montbarrochio," while reference was also made to other similar manifestations which were then believed to be going on at San Genecio and at Terni.² At the risk—I fear, the very serious risk—of overtaxing my readers' patience, it seems necessary to try to give some idea of the frequency with which these similar manifestations have also occurred within recent memory in different parts of Italy.

Confining ourselves to cases where the evidence is based on some sort of official investigation, and for this reason passing over such an example as that of Vicovaro, between Rome and Subiaco, in 1863,³ we may notice first the Madonna known under the invocation, "Ave Regina Cœlorum," in the sanctuary of S. Maria della Croce, near Crema. This, during the greater part of 1869 and 1870, was observed by large crowds to move its eyes, exactly as is narrated of the other Madonnas previously described. The Italian Government, or at any rate the police officials, threatened to intervene, so as to prevent resort to the shrine, and the matter in 1869 was much discussed both in the religious and the

¹ *Relation*, p. 63. and cf. p. 53.

² *The Rambler*, September, 1850, p. 277.

³ I have no reason to suppose that the phenomena at Vicovaro were less remarkable than those at Rimini or Campocavallo, but I have been unable to meet with any first-hand statement. That published by Curicque, *Voix Prophétiques*, 5th Edit., I., 196 seq., is based mainly on accounts given in various religious journals.

infidel Press of the district. An ecclesiastical commission was appointed to sift the evidence of witnesses, and a book of over 300 pages was eventually published upon the subject by a priest, Don Silvio della Noce.¹ He professes himself absolutely convinced of the genuineness of the phenomena, declaring, for example:

Without fear of exaggeration it may be said that every kind of movement possible for eyelids and pupils was witnessed in this case. There was perceptible movement and imperceptible movement, movement slow and rapid, movement continuous and intermittent, and, speaking of the pupils, movement both vertical and horizontal. It should be noticed also that sometimes the movements were visible to all present, at other times only to a few.²

With regard to this last statement, I venture to suggest that, while it is quite easy to ascertain that on certain occasions many observers failed to see the prodigy, it would be extremely difficult to prove convincingly that on certain other occasions it was perceived by all the individuals present in a large crowd. One striking feature in the case seems to have been the testimony of a certain expert in physics and optics, G. M. Cavalleri, who declared that it was absolutely impossible to attribute the phenomena observed to any trick of light or to any physical cause known to that branch of science.

The sensation caused by the happenings at Campocavallo in 1892—1893 claims rather fuller notice. Campocavallo at that date was not even a hamlet; it was simply the name of a farm about six miles from Loreto and in the diocese of Osimo. One of the outbuildings, however, had some years before been converted into a chapel for the convenience of the rural population scattered around, and a priest came from a little distance to say Mass there. The poor chapel thus formed was almost bare of ornament except for two oleographs, about 20 inches by 16, one of which is a reproduction of a well-known picture by Murillo. It was this picture, representing Our Lady as *Mater Dolorosa*, which, on June 16, 1892, the feast of *Corpus Christi*, attracted the attention of a few pious women who were praying before it.

¹ *Sul prodigioso movimento degli Occhi dell' immagine "Ave Regina Cælorum,"* etc., pel Sac. Silvio della Noce, Milan, 1870. I know this work only through the extracts given in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, April, 1871, pp. 58, seq.

² *Ibid.* p. 59.

Strange to say, they did not perceive any movement of the eyes, which are turned heavenwards, but they believed that they saw the face covered with drops of moisture, as it were with tears, which trickled down. They told the keeper of the chapel, and he, after seeing for himself, went to inform the priest who said Mass there. The priest was incredulous, but nevertheless he came, out of the ordinary course, to say Mass there again next morning, and he himself then saw this marvellous transudation so clearly that he was afterwards willing to take an oath of its reality. No doubt the news of these things spread rapidly, and that afternoon, June 17th, there was already a small crowd of pious worshippers, all anxious to get as close as possible to the picture. Suddenly, as they knelt and prayed, an exclamation, we are told, broke simultaneously from their lips. The eyes of the Madonna were moving. All had seen it. The people went home and told their friends. The tidings soon reached the Bishop of Osimo, whose cathedral city was close at hand, and he at once ordered his clergy to be on their guard against any imprudence in encouraging these alleged marvels. But the renown of Campocavallo spread, and here again were renewed the scenes, already so often described. Crowds came from far and near. An episcopal commission of inquiry was appointed. Of the good faith of many of the witnesses no doubt is possible,¹ while a substantial proof of the earnest devotion of the faithful was supplied by the erection at Campocavallo of a basilica of which the first stone was laid by the Bishop of the diocese in the same year, on December 10, 1892. Two testimonies may be cited in support of the conviction so widely evinced of the genuineness of the phenomenon. First of all, the Bishop, Mgr. Egidio Mauri, O.P., a year later was translated to the Archdiocese of Ferrara, where he was soon afterwards created Cardinal. In his farewell address to his flock at Osimo, he paid an eloquent tribute to Our Lady of Campocavallo, indicating in the clearest language his belief in the supernatural character

¹ An article in the *Civiltà Cattolica* for June 3, 1893, quotes the depositions of several witnesses in full. A single specimen may be given on account of its brevity. It is the testimony of a gentleman of Osimo, who wrote, July 13, 1892: "I went to-day for the sixth time to Campocavallo; I looked at the beautiful picture of S. Maria Addolorata, and I saw, as plainly as I see the sun, that it moved its eyes. Of this I make affidavit on oath, and to prove its truth I would give all the blood of my veins" (p. 519).

of the prodigies which had been witnessed there.¹ But perhaps the most impressive piece of evidence is to be found in the booklet of the Reverend Father D. A. Mortier, a distinguished Dominican, who for his work, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, was not long since awarded by the Académie Française the larger portion of the prix Juteau-Duvigneaux. Père Mortier's account of Campocavallo was printed in 1893, and he himself was on more than one occasion an eye-witness of the prodigy. In the section headed "Ma déposition personnelle," he begins with the following words:

I am not at all a miracle-monger. I should even have to say, to be quite honest, that by temperament the marvellous repels me and that I am somewhat tinged with scepticism. The first impression I experienced when I heard of the miracle was one of distrust.²

He also informs us that his eyes are good and that he is neither long- nor short-sighted. Having to visit Loreto on business towards the end of March, 1893, he took occasion to visit Campocavallo, having for his companion a French priest. On the way both of them rather made fun of the supposed manifestations, but on coming to the shrine, to quote Père Mortier's own words:

I knelt down before the picture, a short way off it, and I began to say my rosary without the least emotion. After a minute or two, while still remaining on my knees, I was surprised to see the eyes of the Madonna directed towards me, although when I first came they were turned heavenwards. I rose to my feet believing I was the victim of some illusion. Standing upright, close to the railing and two paces from the picture, I first took careful note that the eyes were wide open and raised towards heaven; then I saw the Madonna lower her gaze and turn it upon me, and finally I perceived that gently and impressively she closed her eyelids completely. I was quite calm. Four or five times over the same prodigy was repeated. Although I retained my composure, it seems that my face must have shown something, for my incredulous companion pulling me by the sleeve remarked "You see it." I lit a candle at the shrine and we set off home.

¹ "Un venti mesi fa, o cara Madonna di Campocavallo, tu eri ignota al mondo; ma un giorno gli occhi di una tua povera Immagine si mossero prodigiosamente, e da quel momento milioni e milioni di labbra ti chiamano beata." *Ultimi Scritti del Cardinale Egidio Mauri O.P. Archivescovo di Ferrara* (Roma, 1900), p. 186.

² D. A. Mortier, O.P., *La Madone de Campocavallo*, Abbeville, 1893, p. 20.

Apart from a word of caution to his companion, Father Mortier kept absolute silence regarding this first experience, but he determined to return to Campocavallo a fortnight later when the impression had worn off. On this second visit (April 4th) he said Mass there, and after breakfast, when the crowd of worshippers had almost entirely dispersed, he came and stood close to the Madonna, reciting his rosary and frequently turning his eyes away from the picture to rest them. Under these circumstances, as he explains:

I saw distinctly the holy picture lower its eyes, fix them upon me with a slow and protracted gaze, and then, with the same majestic deliberation which I had noticed at my first visit, gently close the eyelids. This movement of the eyelids is slow, more slow than nature, for ordinarily the eyelids close instantaneously.

After this he changed his position many times, but witnessed the phenomenon again and again, as each appeal to Our Blessed Lady for fresh assurance was responded to. On returning to Loreto he was invited to give evidence before the Commission. His examination lasted nearly two hours, and in the course of it, after taking an oath on the Gospels, he answered over twenty questions. On April 8th he paid a final visit to Campocavallo, and again witnessed the prodigy. He tells us that on this occasion—

Two French ladies, full of faith and very anxious, especially one of them, to see the miracle, said to me: "Father, how do the eyes appear to you now?" "Madame," I replied: "I see them shut—now they are opening—but they are drooping again, and once more they shut." She returned: "As for me, I see nothing. They are wide open, fixed on heaven." A good fellow twitches my habit: "Padre, the Madonna is closing her eyes." I tell him that I see the same movement as he does, and he is delighted. The French ladies meanwhile saw nothing at all, to their great mortification.

Father Mortier, like the witnesses in other similar manifestations, insists much upon the simultaneity of the exclamations heard when a movement of the eyes is perceived,¹ and

¹ "Tout le monde ne voyait pas, mais souvent nombre de personnes étrangères les unes aux autres criaient en même temps comme d'une seule voix 'La Madone remue les yeux.' Cette simultanéité, se traduisant par un cri, ne peut donner lieu à la moindre illusion. Ces braves gens, émus jusqu'au fond de l'âme ne pouvaient retenir leurs larmes. Quelquefois on entendait des petits enfants dire tout à coup: Père, vois donc comme la Madone lève les yeux; vois comme elle les baisse." Mortier, *La Madone de Campocavallo*, p. 12.

he, together with the writer in the *Civiltà*, lays stress upon the fact that the spontaneous exclamations of the children form very valuable evidence of the genuineness of their perceptions. This is a point of which it is difficult to obtain quite satisfactory proof, but the argument is one that cannot be lightly dismissed.

I have left myself little space to deal with one last manifestation of the same kind which began in 1895, and has apparently often been witnessed since, in the church of San Michele at Rovigo. The phenomena are apparently exactly similar to those already described, and a careful account of them has been given in a booklet compiled, with the full approval and blessing of the Bishop of the Diocese, by Professor Giacomo Sichirolo. It is a curious fact that, though the author stoutly champions the reality of the prodigy, he was never able to witness it himself.¹ On the other hand, in his second edition, he calls attention to the curious case of Canon Eugenio Villega. He had visited the church three days in April, 1900, and fifteen days in November of the same year, but had been unable to detect any movement in the eyes of the picture. On December 7th he went again, but still saw nothing. On that day, however, before he left the church, a poor man kneeling near him, cried out that the prodigy was happening, and thereupon the Canon suddenly and unexpectedly saw the eyes turn upon himself, the irises moving slowly from right to left and then back again. The sight, we are told, quite unnerved him.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ Professor Giacomo Sichirolo, *Il Movimento degli Occhi dell' Addolorata che si venera in San Michele di Rovigo*. Edizione 2^a. Milano, 1901. "Io non ebbi mai," so he writes, "la grazia di veder muoversi quegli occhi benedetti, ch'empirono di stupore e di meraviglia tanti anime talora neppur credenti" (p. 65).

ALICE

I.

AN old man and a child sat together within a meanly-furnished room. They were not relations, merely next-door neighbours in a city slum; two lonely souls who had drifted together like two derelicts in a waste of waters. The child was a little girl of about seven called Mary. She was very small, and when she had attended the invalid school, before she became too delicate to go there, she had enjoyed the distinction of being the very smallest child in that school of small children. Large dark eyes looked out of her tiny pinched face, and the intelligence that shone in them seemed scarcely of the world, and was certainly not of her age. Distorted by rickets, she could hardly stand upright, and walking was a task to be achieved with no small difficulty. She should have been the gentle object of someone's love, but she was almost uncared-for. In her empty slum home there were no picture-books and no toys; there was nothing to appeal to her fancy, nothing to beautify her life of sordid reality. Not even a sunbeam danced upon the wall, for into that dreary slum a ray of sunlight never seemed to penetrate or a pure wind from heaven to blow. She had never seen flowers grow or heard the song of birds. She was like a prisoner and her home was like a cell. In it she spent hours so sad and lonely that one wondered why God allowed such unmerited suffering in what seemed the meaningless tragedy of this child's life.

A few weeks ago she and her mother had moved into the room next to the old man's, and he and the child had come together in a mutual loneliness. One other tie they had—the tie of their common faith.

How Mary had discovered kinship in this silent old man was her own secret, yet it is certain that his kindness lighted the gloom of her days, for her mother was seldom in the house. She was a mother in name only—one of those to whom drink is the answer to the riddle of the universe.

But Mary's instinct had been unerring, for the old man had a soul of childlike simplicity. He was very worn and bent, and although his failing feet were almost at their

journey's end, he still worked daily as a labourer. In the eye of the world he was a failure in life, an encumbrance dragging at the wheels of progress. However, the world does not divine the inner qualities, and his fortitude and patience in the miseries that press the poor down were known only to Him who knows all. Poor in worldly goods, he was rich in faith—a faith which grew stronger in adversity—and seems the portion of few but the weak and broken. Every action of his life was accompanied by prayer—a humble whispering to God, the Father of the Poor. As he went his way unheeding and unheeded, his soul was wrapt in a mystic silence broken only by His voice. Unlettered as he was, he knew all the rapture of a poet in this sense of the presence of God, which he had cultivated all his silent and frugal days, and it seemed a thing of small account that He who walked thus with him should demand in return a hard and toilsome life.

He had a daughter, Alice, and it was of her he spoke to the child as they sat together. He did not speak of what she was, or of his grief for her blighted life, but he spoke of what she had been. He told Mary how winning Alice had been as a child; of how everyone had loved her—he, perhaps, too much.

"Was she very beautiful?" asked the child.

"Yes, very beautiful," said the old man. "And most beautiful on her First Communion day. I can see her still, dressed all in white, with a smile on her lips like a ray of sunlight. And she sang so sweetly that it made me think of angels."

"She must have been very happy to look like that," said the little girl.

"Yes, but everyone is happy on a First Communion day."

"Are you quite sure she is coming home to-morrow?" asked the child.

"Yes, quite sure."

"And will she never go away again?"

A shadow crossed the old man's face, but he answered hopefully:

"Please God, never again. We will both pray that she will never go away again."

The old man's thoughts wandered into the past as if he could thus forget the present, and the child too was silent, thinking of Alice. She longed for the morrow that she might

know this wonderful being. She wanted to meet her because she had so many things to ask. At school the imaginative child had learnt something of the wonders of religion. She did not know precisely what a First Communion was, but she had heard of a Mother in Heaven, and she had seen a picture of her standing with outstretched hands, seeming to the child to be offering her that love denied by an earthly mother. Alice would be sure to know all about her; and who so well fitted to speak of her as one who had looked and sung like an angel on her First Communion day?

It was next day, and Alice drew her shawl more closely around her so as to conceal her face as she walked with bent head and downcast eyes along the familiar slum street. She had been glad to leave the prison and the police officials, whose looks, so full of horrible meaning, seemed to divest her of what little chastity she still possessed. She was glad to leave the street where well-dressed people glanced askance at her, or drew their skirts aside in passing, glad to reach the familiar slum where there are no Pharisees and where an occasional smile of welcome greeted her.

But as she drew near to her home a sense of loneliness and a dread of the future came upon her, and she felt loath to enter the chill and poverty-stricken room whose neglected appearance after those absences she knew only too well. For Alice had been in prison many times, and she felt no certainty that she would not be there many times again. She was young—not yet thirty—and, like that other Magdalene, she was beautiful. At times there was a quality of wistfulness in her expression which seemed to say that she had expected life to be kind to her, and was childishly hurt and surprised that it had thrust her forth upon this sinful course, the end of which she trembled to contemplate. She scarcely knew how it had begun! To a motherless girl, life is dangerous in a slum. She cannot keep the innocence of childhood long. Before she is capable of understanding its meaning she received her knowledge of the sacred and beautiful mysteries of life from the filthy lips of vice. As you gazed at Alice you saw some vestiges of her days of innocence shine through her recklessness and despair. Her wasted life had obliterated many of those gracious traces, but in the mingled texture of her nature some good still endured. There had been preserved from those far-off days something which inspired

moments of secret remorse, and gave her the "gift of tears"; for once sown in the soul the seed of the Catholic Faith can seldom quite wither away.

Arriving at last at her home, Alice entered it. The dreary room, with the dead ashes on the hearth, seemed symbolic of her life. She sat wearily down and leaned her head upon her hand, her heart full of desolate melancholy.

Whilst she sat thus she heard the sound of little shuffling feet, and in a moment Mary showed her face at the door and walked into the room. Alice looked at her and pitied the little thing.

"Are you Alice?" asked the child.

"Yes," said Alice, in surprise; "who are you?"

For answer the child looked earnestly at Alice, and seeing nothing dark or doubtful in her face, but trusting to all she had heard of her, put her little thin arms about her neck and held her very close. And Alice thought she felt a tear upon her cheek.

She had made an attempt to prepare a meal in her own room, and as she took Alice there to partake of it, she looked up into her face and smiled as one who had found a friend.

II.

Alice and her father met that night as they always did on these occasions. They gazed at each other, trembling on the verge of tears, but the moment passed, for the poor in their emotions are inarticulate, and in consequence suffer so much the more. But the simple old man thanked Heaven as for a special blessing that Alice was home again. Sometimes weeks would pass before she gave way to temptation, and during that time she would keep the home clean and make her father comfortable; then the inevitable would happen, and when such as Alice are "known to the police," a very slight offence is sufficient to send them within a prison cell.

But Mary knew nothing of this, and every hour found her lingering near Alice's side or sitting on the floor, with her bent legs tucked under her, looking like a quaint little image, and watching Alice as she occupied herself in household tasks. The child, usually so silent, talked as if she were making up for the past hours of loneliness, and drew from Alice satisfying answers to all that had puzzled her in her thoughts of Heaven, of which place Alice drew a bright, beautiful picture

without any sombre tints in it at all. Mary would not have thought it in the least extraordinary if the wise and wonderful Alice had brought an angel or a saint in person to her side. And when she had been assured that she was neither too small nor too poor to go to Heaven, she said, seriously: "I should like to go there soon."

"Come," said Alice, "you must not have those mournful fancies."

"Why?" asked the child. "Is Heaven not a happy place?"

"Yes, very happy. But you must not go away and leave me yet," and the child answered, "No"—she would not go. But perhaps the old-fashioned mite knew that Heaven, for her, was not such a very far-off land.

Alice was so gentle, so ready to pet and mother her, that Mary loved her dearer and dearer every day. The child, made sensitive by suffering, dimly divined that Alice knew heartache too, and tried in many silent ways to comfort her; and by reason of that innocent belief in her she was soon enshrined in Alice's desolate heart.

Mary never grew weary of hearing of the wonders of that First Communion day, and although Alice would rather have kept silent on that past event, the memory of which smote so keenly on her heart, she could not bear to disappoint the child, and so, in spite of a hateful feeling of hypocrisy, she kept up the loving pretence of being a good Catholic.

Mary loved, above everything, to listen to hymns of Our Lady. She had, as a favourite, the hymn beginning:

Mother, Mother, I am coming
Home to Jesus and to Thee.

and she could not hear it too often. When she was very weak and weary, Alice rocked her in her arms and sang this hymn, not cheerfully, but in a low, faint, sorrowing way, too humble to raise her voice. As she sang, all the bitterness of her life rose up before her, and when she came to the words,

Lest perchance my feet should stray
Meet me, Mother, on my way.

her eyes always filled with burning tears. And the child would say: "When I think of her I want to cry too, Alice, because I love her so much."

"But I cry because I have not loved her enough," said Alice.

"Never mind, she loves you, Alice. Indeed," the child added earnestly, "I wonder that everyone does not love her very, very much."

The child against Alice's breast brought into being a host of gentle thoughts. She felt for it a tenderness like pain, and her heart was filled with the penetrating emotion of love, almost wholly spiritual, which a mother feels when she clasps her first-born child. For a moment she would fall into a sweet reverie, in which the dark vista of her past was blotted out and the future seemed full of worthy potentialities, of sacred motherhood. Then, with a pang, she would remember, and know that this was a dream which could never be more real than the brightly-coloured rainbow made by her tears.

The days went on, and Alice could see the little face grow smaller and the large, dark eyes grow larger. It seemed as if Mary had waited only to know Alice before she began to droop and fade; as if, having accomplished her mission, the little angel messenger could now wing back to God. For Alice had remained insensible to the eloquent appeals of Mission Fathers, to the earnest persuasions of nuns, and to the knowledge that she was breaking her father's heart, only to be touched at last by this little child. Her hand had unconsciously struck the chord that responded, and had inflicted on the heart of Alice the "wound of true contrition."

Only a few weeks after their first meeting, the little girl went "on her homeward way." It did not seem like death. Held in Alice's arms and soothed by her soft singing, she closed her eyes—eyes undimmed by the shadow of a single sin—to open them on the shining vision of the adorable Mother, whose name was the last she heard on earth.

III.

After the child's death, when Alice and her father were left alone, he feared that, deprived of its love, and with no resources within herself, she would fall back into the old way of life. But something had happened to Alice. There had taken possession of her a persistent deep melancholy which pressed on her soul, troubling her to tears. She did not yet know it, but it was a Divine pressure, something analogous to the Voice which said: "Why persecutest thou Me?" And Alice would not know peace until she submitted her-

self to God in one of those conversions which tell us, impressively, that His miracles still go on. Her father saw Alice's sadness, and said to her:

"Are you grieving after the child?"

"Oh, no; I think of her as mingling with the angels. Who would wish her back to this dreary world?"

"Then what ails you, daughter?"

Poor Alice burst into tears.

"Oh, father, my sinful, sinful life!"

The old man sent a silent prayer to Heaven in an agony of supplication, but all he could say was: "Then, Alice, if you feel like that, you know what to do."

There was a church in that slum district. Set in the midst of a quarter peopled by the evil-living, it stood in silent appeal to hearts which seemed too hard to touch. It was dedicated to a saint, but it might fitly have been consecrated to "Our Lady of Sorrows," for it was a sad church, and it had sorrowful worshippers who went in and out during the day. Ragged, uncared-for children went in hand-in-hand, and their solemn, wondering eyes roved all around the church, noting everything. Poverty-stricken women who, crushed and oppressed on earth, came to beg a boon from Heaven, and to leave a lighted taper glimmering like a pale star as an earnest of their thanks. How touching were their fervent prayers, whispered through tears. Only the poor can pray thus, because they have suffered so much. There were other women dreadful to look upon, battered by life, dulled by drink, they crept in clumsily, walking on tip-toe, and abased themselves before the High Altar, overawed by the splendour and silence of its Hidden God. Timid and ashamed, it is to the Lady Altar they go, and kneel, stained with impurities as they are, at the feet of Mary Immaculate, who numbers amongst her attributes "Refuge of Sinners."

To this church Alice went, impelled by a longing for peace; and ever urged by "His love Who followed," she found herself at length in that place of healing for sick souls—the confessional. After so many years of wandering, she knelt there, and whilst her tumultuously beating heart surged alternately with hopefulness and despair, she listened to the Voice of God in the immemorial words of absolution.

Alice left the confessional vaguely wondering why she did not feel happy, wondering how she could ever endure the burden of her sordid life again. And when she thought of

the morrow, when her union with God would be a sacred reality, she trembled from head to foot.

The crucifix is the refuge-point for the unhappy. Inside the church was a large crucifix, on the pierced Feet of which someone had laid a little flower. It was withered now, and as Alice knelt, crushed by the infinite sadness, the mournful regret of the penitent sinner, she was filled with one passionate desire to kneel there for ever—never to stir—but to rest close beside those wounded Feet, to die there even as that little flower.

When Alice reached home her father was awaiting her.

"Have you been to confession, Alice?" he asked, gently.

"Yes, I have."

"And do you feel happier?"

Alice told him of her sadness, of her need to shed those bitter, lacerating tears.

"Have faith, Alice. God wants you to weep for your sins. Even if you cannot forgive yourself He has forgiven you. Go to Holy Communion in the morning and all will be well."

"I am not worthy!"

The words, repeated glibly every day by so many careless lips, came from the very depths of Alice's broken heart! Would that all of us could say it thus even once in a lifetime.

Then the old man, in his quiet, patient way, recalled that instance of mercy and compassion—surely the most touching in the ministry of our Lord—when He suffered such a one as she to kneel at His sacred Feet and bathe them in her tears; to whom He said: "Go in peace."

"And maybe, Alice," said the old man earnestly, "our Lord, who saw down all the ages, when He said those blessed words to the Magdalene, gave just one little thought to you."

And gradually that sweet peace which passeth comprehension began to enfold Alice like an ineffably tender caress. The miracle was completed!

Alice worked hard to enable her father to end his days in ease; and when at length the old man died, Alice, a true mystic, athirst for suffering, eager to expiate, offered the rest of her life to God in the silence of the cloister. The Church, a magnanimous Mother, has a special niche for everyone within her loving, enfolding arms.

J. M. CRONIN.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.¹

1. General Aspects.

NO sincere Christian can ignore, or wish to ignore, the earnestness which stamps every part of the Encyclical Letter prefixed to the Report of the recent Lambeth Conference. Even though we fear that the pronouncement can lead to no practical result so far as reunion with the Catholic Church is concerned, we cordially welcome and sympathize with the spirit which has animated the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in framing their appeal. For centuries past the divisions of Christendom have not only hampered all missionary effort but they have had the hardly less regrettable effect of developing unduly that controversial temper which tends to absorb—and how rarely to any good purpose!—the energies of the best and wisest on both sides. Friction can hardly ever be regarded otherwise than as a profitless loss of power, and when we have endless divisions we have a maximum of friction. From this point of view, though *divide et impera* might seem to be the maxim which best serves the material interests of the true Church of Christ in regard to other communions, we have ourselves no wish to see that great body of high-principled and devout Protestants who still retain a personal love of our Saviour and conscientiously strive to put His teaching into practice, continuously weakened and discouraged by internal disintegration. None of us can find subject of rejoicing in the further spread of unbelief and religious indifference. Education and patriotism are both excellent things in their way, but we put much more reliance in Christianity, even that which, from our point of view, is an imperfect Christianity, than in either of these two forces, as a bulwark against the rising tide of Bolshevism which seems to threaten us in the near future. Therefore if the appeal of the Anglican Bishops should enable the various Protestant communions in this country and abroad to present a more

¹ Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, holden at Lambeth Palace, July 5 to August 7, 1920. Encyclical Letter with Resolutions and Reports. S.P.C.K. 1920.

united front in fighting the anti-Christian principles and tendencies which the cataclysm of the last six years has brought to the surface, we can heartily wish it God speed. We do not think that anything said in the Report on the desirability of Reunion is likely to check the keenness of those who find that submission to Rome is the only logical outcome of the present *impasse*, and on the other hand we do think that the realization of the dangers of the times, which has roused the Bishops to an effort to sink their differences and to lay greater stress on spiritual ideals, must ultimately make for good. So far as the literary presentment of this manifesto is concerned, all must be impressed by its ring of sincerity and its tactful wording. Just as no difference in religious standpoint can prevent our paying homage to the felicity of language conspicuous in the Book of Common Prayer and in the Authorized Version of King James I., so we do not hesitate to say that the Anglicanism of these later times has produced no worthier or more dignified monument of its aspirations than the volume issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

With regard to Reunion in its larger aspects we cannot find anything in the Encyclical or the Resolutions before us which would awaken a hope of healing the great historical schisms by which Christendom has been divided for so many centuries. It is possible that amid the calamities which have lately befallen the Russian and some other Eastern Churches, there may be a growing tendency among the more progressive of Oriental Churchmen to turn their eyes westwards in hope of succour. But history tells us that such rapprochements and even the acceptance of a common confession of faith have taken place before without results of any lasting kind. Moreover, even Anglicans must recognize that of all the so-called "branches" of the Church the most important, both as regards numerical diffusion and vitality, is that which accepts the supremacy of the Holy See. We can see no signs of any anticipation on the part of the Bishops that Rome will modify her present attitude. Strangely enough, however, the *Church Times* seems to think that in the following passage the Bishops have gone as far in the way of an overture as the dignity of the Anglican Church would permit.

We believe [say the Bishops] that for all, the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences. To this end, we who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other Communion should

so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from those authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church. It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry.

Commenting on this passage the *Church Times* (August 13th) observes:

It [the Appeal] holds out a hand to Rome in a remarkable offer. If other terms of union can be satisfactorily adjusted, it says, we should not be unwilling to accept "a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations." When Mr. Clayton made the suggestion at the Anglo-Catholic Congress that it might help to bring Reunion nearer if we were willing to accept conditional ordination it startled many people. It seemed to go much further than anyone had yet gone. But here are the Bishops at Lambeth making almost the same suggestion. No one after this can doubt the absolute sincerity of the desire for Reunion with Rome.

If the passage quoted above is to be regarded as an overture to the Holy See on the basis of a willingness to accept conditional reordination, we can only say that the language is extremely guarded. No action could conceivably be taken by any representative Catholic authority except on much more explicit grounds. And yet we are glad to take note of this utterance, however unauthorized, as at least bearing witness to the ideas which seem to be germinating in the minds of the more advanced section of our Anglican friends. But the hope that such ideas can bear fruit on a large scale seems to us extremely remote; and we heartily associate ourselves with the views expressed in the admirable leading article printed in *The Tablet* for August 21st. Still the frank discussion of these questions and possibilities is a gain, and we should be only too happy to welcome the Lambeth Report as pointing the way, however vaguely, to the only means by which Reunion may at last be reached.

H. T.

2. Lambeth and the Church's Indefectibility.

THE trend towards the reunion of Christendom, which first became a part of Anglican ecclesiastical policy in this country at the time of the Oxford Movement, and which has latterly affected even the Free Churches, will probably receive an accession of strength from the Lambeth Conference. It is after all a natural tendency, for one can hardly imagine anyone reading the New Testament without prejudice, and not realizing that Christ meant to found a visible, united, authoritative, indefectible Church, and that His apostles, who best knew His mind, were convinced that He had done so. Whatever else is vague, he who runs may surely read that there. Yet the exigencies of polemics, the necessity of justifying their position outside the bounds of the only institution which claims exclusively to be Christ's Church, have caused many men, both before and since the Reformation, either to blur the Gospel-picture of the Church or to maintain more or less explicitly that Christ's project had failed—a conclusion which tends to a disbelief in His Divinity or is itself the outcome of that disbelief. Now, it is to the credit of Anglicanism that, alone of the schismatic Churches, it has retained, in its formulæ at least, the notion of the visible, undivided Church, although it has been driven, by the need of reconciling the facts of its past and present history with the ideal, to many desperate shifts in defining that notion, and, we are happy to say, the unity and visibility of the Church find, once more, emphatic assertion in one of the resolutions of the Conference.¹ The Bishops declare God's purpose to have been to establish "an outward visible and united society, holding one faith"; if they had only added,—"*infallible as speaking with His authority; indefectible as sustained by His power,*"—they would have expressed, adequately enough, the right Catholic doctrine, for no society can be effectively united which is not one in government, or can remain united, unless that single government is permanent and authoritative. The other notes of the Church which the Bishops add—"having its own recognized officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God"—indicate somewhat vaguely its Apostolicity and Holiness, the existence of a God-appointed ecclesiastical state and of certain sacramental rites.

¹ "We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible and united society, holding one faith . . ." Conference Resolutions, 9. §. 1.

Now, the fact that these learned and God-fearing men are thus earnestly exerting themselves to bring about God's declared purpose in regard to His Church is a sign that they do not believe that that purpose has been already and permanently effected. The Church which Christ instituted and which He prophesied should never cease to exist, is not, in their opinion, now to be found amongst men as He planned it. If they thought it was, we cannot doubt that they would feel it their duty to join it: for thus the work they are engaged in, the realization of Christ's plan, would be clearly superfluous. Their own body does not answer even to their own defective definition of that plan, and conspicuously fails in the matter of teaching infallibly. Again, they hold that "Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith," and consequently cannot be the Church which Christ set up. And, of course, the Free Churches, non-Episcopal, non-Sacramental, radically disunited, are equally far from the ideal He put forth. Consequently for them the "Holy Catholic Church," which is one of the articles of the creed, is not a present reality, but merely an aspiration. The "Gates of Hell," or some other influences, *have* prevailed against that Church which came to birth at Pentecost, and for a time at least destroyed it. If none of the separate organized Christian bodies still extant is the true Church, the true Church has ceased to exist. A Church whose essential note is Unity, loses its identity when it is divided. Yet Christ committed Himself to the unqualified promise, the fulfilment of which is independent of human volition, that He would be with His Church all days, even to the consummation of the world, to keep her from destruction at the hands of her foes. There is no getting over the fact that the Anglican position, as thus acknowledged by the Bishops at Lambeth, presupposes the failure of Christ's prophecy and promise.¹ In their thought, our Father in Heaven, after going to the extreme trouble of revealing His will through the suffering Life and Death of His Son, has allowed any adequate witness to that revelation to die out for a long period of the world's history; for none of them, we may presume, considers the Bible as the sole and sufficient Rule of Faith. What then they are really aiming at is to accomplish a work which has turned out to be beyond the Divine Power. If the God-man could not pre-

¹ It is true that in their Encyclical they assert—"Again, the one Body exists. It needs not to be made, nor to be re-made, but to become organic and visible." This means that now at any rate we have only a "Body" which is not "organic" nor "visible." Such is certainly not the Church of Christ.

serve His Church from disintegration, what warrant have we that He can aid men to build it up again? It is surely simpler and more consonant with the facts of history to conclude that Christ's work has not failed, that His Church still persists substantially as He planned her, and that the whole duty of those who find their own religious body out of harmony with His plan is to search for one which is not. For the "City set upon a Hill" is a very definite thing with boundaries and gates, and unless you are within them you are outside.

J. K.

3. Light from the Conference on the English "Old Catholics."

THERE are some curiously interesting details unexpectedly furnished in the Lambeth Report we are examining, regarding the relations of the late Bishop A. H. Mathew with the "Old Catholic" Church of Holland. The question of Bishop Mathew's consecration at Utrecht originally attracted the attention of the Anglican hierarchy as far back as 1908, the very year in which the ceremony took place. The Lambeth Conference, held later in that year, deprecated in Resolution 69 "the setting up of a new organized body in regions where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion." It is now explicitly stated that this utterance was virtually a protest against the action of the Dutch bishops in consecrating Mathew for work in this country, and that the resolution in question was, at the request of the Conference, communicated to the Archbishop of Utrecht by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In reply, the Archbishop of Utrecht offered explanations, and further, gave an undertaking that in future "they would take care not to make trouble by encroaching on the order of a friendly Church." This answer does not, however, seem to have been made public at the time, and there, strangely enough, the matter rested for twelve years until, after the death of Bishop Mathew, the Old Catholic Bishops, when assembled at Utrecht on April 28 and 29, 1920, issued a pronouncement in which—we quote textually from the Lambeth Report—

they state categorically that the episcopal consecration of the Rev. A. H. Mathew "was surreptitiously secured by the production of false testimony, and would never have taken place had the consecrators known that the conditions stated in the questionable documents and required by our Episcopate were non-existent." They also state that on the discovery of the facts

they "broke off intercourse with him," and "without entering on the question whether an ordination obtained by sacrilegious fraud can be valid" declare that they "have no ecclesiastical relations" with those persons who claim to have received ordination or consecration from the aforesaid person.

It is a little unfortunate that all this comes to light after the death of the person incriminated, and it is also unfortunate that a month or more after his consecration in 1908, the Old Catholic Bishops, in reference to certain difficulties that had been raised, wrote to *The Guardian* in these terms:

We wish now to state that our confidence in Bishop Mathew remains unshaken, after carefully perusing a large number of the documents bearing upon this matter, and we earnestly hope that his ministrations will be abundantly blessed by Almighty God, and that he will receive the cordial support of the British people and the Church in the trying circumstances in which he has been placed.¹

We certainly have no idea of justifying Bishop Mathew in the proceedings which led up to, and followed his consecration, but it is equally impossible to acquit the Old Catholic Episcopate of playing a very undignified part in the business. Neither can it be hoped that the tardy repentance of the Anglican Church, which now finds expression in Resolution 27 of the 1920 Conference, will do much to counteract the immense mischief which her *laissez faire* policy during a dozen years has allowed to go on unchecked. But first let us quote the terms of this Resolution 27:

We regret [says the Conference] that on a review of all the facts we are unable to regard the so-called Old Catholic Church in Great Britain (under the late Bishop Mathew and his successors), and its extensions overseas, as a properly constituted Church, or to recognize the order of its ministers, and we recommend that, in the event of any of its ministers desiring to join our Communion, who are in other respects duly qualified, they should be ordained *sub conditione* in accordance with the provisions suggested in the Report of our Committee.

This, if only it be carried out in practice, is an excellent piece of legislation, but it comes unfortunately very late, neither is there any indication of a wish to impose penalties upon those who choose to disregard either its letter or its spirit. Can the Bishops really be ignorant that hundreds of Anglican clergymen, while still retaining their benefices in the Church of England, have sought reordination at the

¹ Letter published in *The Guardian*, for June 3, 1908.

hands of Bishop Mathew, his coadjutors and successors? Is it not a fact that clergymen have been accepted for parochial work in the diocese of London who possess no other Orders than those received through Bishop Mathew? Is it not also a fact that one or more incumbents of Anglican cures have quite recently obtained episcopal consecration from the Mathew faction without resigning their position in the ministry of the Church of England? Of course all these things may have happened without the knowledge of, or indeed, in defiance of episcopal authority, and it is quite likely that this is in fact the case. But, be this as it may, we are glad, at any rate that some slight check has been set by the Established Church upon this practice of hole-and-corner ordinations, which unfortunately, instead of dying out with the disappearance of the unfortunate originator of the system, is being energetically pushed on by at least one party of his successors. As Catholics, we of course hold that the more obviously invalid these sacrilegious attempts to transmit schismatical Orders are the better. And, indeed, when ordinations and consecrations are carried out in the private rooms of inns or dwelling-houses by a number of masqueraders, who many of them are as little at home in their parts as so many green-grocers donning masonic aprons and insignia, what possible guarantee can there be that even the ritual provided will be faithfully adhered to? Bishop Mathew, when it suited him to try to throw discredit upon the consecration of a whilom disciple of his, publicly stated in the *Occult Review* that "an essential part of the service was inadvertently admitted,"¹ and this though he (Mathew) was himself the consecrator. The elements omitted do not seem to have been of a very vital character, but, though Bishop Mathew himself must certainly have had plenty of practice in such functions, he owned himself in default on this occasion. The Catholic Church has wisely surrounded the conferring of Orders with an atmosphere of stately ceremonial, venerable tradition and full publicity, so as to form the best security against accidents that might cause invalidity. But these usurpers of sacred Orders are generally left to the mere word of a charlatan for their assurance of the performance of even those most essential rites upon which all validity depends.

H. T.

¹ See the *Occult Review*, May, 1918, p. 251, and cf. Wedgwood's reply, *ibid.* June, 1918, p. 349.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

"Direct Action."

The most startling event of the month has been the dramatic intervention of "Labour" in international politics, apropos of the war between Poland and Soviet Russia. It must be admitted that the policy of the Allies towards the Government of Lenin and Trotsky has been dictated by considerations of pure expediency. It appeared at first that Bolshevism might be stamped out by the various non-Soviet leaders and armies which existed in different parts of Russia. Hence the costly Archangel adventure, the blockade, and the support, moral and material, given to Denikin, Kolchak and the rest. But the result only consolidated Bolshevik rule, and gave Trotsky an excuse for maintaining and increasing the Red armies. Then, in May of this year, came the ill-advised defensive-aggressive, as it has been euphemistically styled, wherein Poland, bankrupt and swept by plague and famine, and needing, of all countries in Europe, the re-establishment of normal conditions, instead of settling down quietly on her ethnographic frontiers, invaded the Ukraine, postponed the peace of which Europe is in deadly need, wasted still more her resources of men and material,—in a word, acted towards Russia with the same disregard of justice as Russia of old had acted towards her. None of the Allies is anxious to take the responsibility for that mad adventure: that they tolerated it or in any way provided means for it is blot enough upon their statesmanship. We have always held that it is war that enables Bolshevism to maintain its hold upon the Russian. Left to develop its godless tyranny in peace it would speedily prove more intolerably corrupt even than the bureaucracy it supplanted. The various attempts made to crush it by foreign aid have enabled it to justify as war-measures its enormous armies, its requisitions, its destruction of civil liberty. Poland is right in detesting it, and she would have been only wise and right to stop the plague at the frontier provisionally fixed by the Allies, and meanwhile attend to her own terrible domestic needs. So she would have escaped the Red invasion and the threat to Warsaw, which made the Allies talk at any rate of armed intervention, and frightened our workers—those who in a new war would have to fight—into their policy of "direct action."

**The Independence
of
Poland.**

Christian justice and European peace alike demand that Poland should be strong and independent. That martyred nation, which has survived to witness the ignominious overthrow of the three monarchies that, in the eighteenth century, basely shared her territory between them, has surely deserved now a free and prosperous future, if only as the symbol of the final triumph

of Right. That Catholic people, preserving the principles of Christian civilization, must necessarily be free if but to keep German and Russian apart to the profit of stable peace. If Poland's long-lost and hard-won independence were really in jeopardy, no one who values the civilization of the West, sadly degenerate though it be, would refuse all that was needed to safeguard it. But the anti-Russian press was prematurely breathing threats of war, the War Minister himself, with surely stupendous folly, was suggesting the re-arming of Germany to oppose the Bolsheviks, whilst all the while these latter, who for the moment were repelling and punishing an unjust aggression, professed their willingness to respect Polish independence on receipt of guarantees of Polish good behaviour. There was room for alarm in those who regard unnecessary war as simply a gigantic crime. The Bolsheviks are Socialists of a sort, of a sort, indeed, that few British Socialists would care to see established here, though their system needs to be distinguished from the godless crew that at present work it. But because they are anti-Capitalist, and because British "Labour" thinks itself anti-Capitalist also, therefore the latter, without scrutinizing their methods too closely, are inclined to take sides with the former against the common foe, and have consistently opposed for that motive the various anti-Russian enterprises supported by the Allies. The demand that the Allies should cease to arm and finance the Poles against Russia is only part of the "Peace with Russia" policy which the workers have advocated all along. Hence their revolt, when it became probable, judging from the tone of the French and English press, that war would be declared by the Allies against Russia in defence of Poland.

The Council a protest against unfair Parliamentary Representation.

This sudden gesture of the Labour leaders, the formation of their "Council of Action," which is supported with a unanimity rare in the history of the movement, has been rightly described both by themselves and their critics as unconstitutional. It is an attempt by a section of the community to dictate the policy of the nation without the co-operation and consent of the other sections: it is an usurpation of the functions for which Parliament was elected. In that precisely lies its significance. So long as the great mass of the workers are discontented, there will be two antagonistic nations in the same State. They were unified partially and temporarily by stress of war: they have fallen apart again since. And they are not kept in even partial harmony by being united in due proportion in Parliament. Owing to the circumstances of the election of 1918, as we pointed out at the time,¹ the Government with its colossal majority rests only upon about a fourth of the

¹ THE MONTH, Feb. 1919, p. 134.

whole voting power of the State, and if the seats had been distributed proportionately to the strength of parties as manifested by their votes, there would be 133 Labour members instead of (then) 63, and the Government's majority would not have exceeded 113. Consequently, we concluded "a large proportion of the electorate has no direct representation, no constitutional means of expressing its will and venting its grievances." Hence, and very naturally, they employ unconstitutional means of doing so.

**The Council
a protest against
Secret
Diplomacy.**

We do not see in this setting up of a "Council of Action," the sole object of which is to restrain the Government from war with Russia, a direct and permanent challenge to the Constitution, and an endeavour to substitute Soviets for Parliament. The idea is doubtless fermenting in some hot and foolish heads, but we are convinced that the average good sense of the British citizen will have none of it. Still it may spread and cause trouble unless Labour is wisely handled. First of all, our rulers must realize that the workers of the world have had enough of war as an ordinary instrument of policy. Man will always fight for hearth and home, and for his liberty and his welfare, but men will no longer fight, knowingly, for financial interests or the exploitation of "inferior races." And the worker in the past has so often had to fight for such sordid things that he now demands, and rightly, a clear and full knowledge of the international policies of his rulers. In other words, the crisis which has called into being "the Council of Action" was simply due to "secret diplomacy," the ignorance in which Parliament and the nation has been left in regard to the foreign policy of the Government. Their sympathy with what they take to be a Socialist Government inclines the workers to take the side of Russia, they know little for certain of the aims and dealings of the Allies in regard to that State, whilst their overt acts, the supplying of munitions, etc., are all pro-Pole; the result is an abundant harvest of suspicion and distrust, which springs quite naturally without the need of any watering from Bolshevik gold. The remedy is to restore Parliament to its proper functions, viz., faithfully to represent the community and in its interests carefully to control the Government. Then there will be no need of "direct action," at least in political concerns.

**Peace the Need
and the Duty of
Poland.**

The astonishing success of the Poles in rallying at the last moment and driving the Bolsheviks from the gates of Warsaw back into Russia leaves us very sceptical about the actual fighting of these campaigns, the news of which, we must remember, comes to us only through the wireless of the belliger-

ents themselves. But the armies doubtless move from place to place, and, just as, according to Mr. Lloyd George,¹ "the Soviet Government was entitled in our opinion to take into account in any conditions of peace the Poles' unjustified attack on Russia," so since the balance of victory now appears to incline towards the Poles they may reasonably stand out for easier conditions than were offered them in the hour of defeat. And certainly they have the right to reject all attempts to dictate their future form of government or any part of their domestic policy. There were points in the Bolsheviks' terms, such as the formation of a workers' militia and the distribution of free land to the families of dead or incapacitated Polish soldiers, which are not the concern of any foreign State. At the moment, the peace negotiations at Minsk seem to have broken off, but the Allies, following the example of the United States, have strongly warned Poland not to pass the frontier provisionally fixed by the Paris Treaty. And so we may hope peace is in sight. There can be little doubt that both nations need peace, and that Russia, at any rate, which has now concluded treaties of peace with all its border States—Finland, Esthonia, Lithuania, Latvia—has no desire to occupy territory which is racially Polish.² No possible benefit can compensate for the needless prolongation of a war which should never have been begun, and which has postponed the reconstruction of Europe for at least a year. The settlement of the eastern frontier is, in any case, a matter which can be arranged more securely and permanently by the League of Nations than by force of arms.

**The Mandate
in
Mesopotamia.**

The Times has been taunting Labour because of its anxiety to stop war, only, it would seem, when Socialists are the sufferers. There is something in the taunt, for the war in Mesopotamia, which *The Times* itself has consistently opposed from the first, is steadily growing in extent and violence, and yet is hardly mentioned in the councils of the workers. The fact that the soldiers employed there, 70,000 of them, are mainly Indian troops may account for this indifference. Yet surely it demands the attention of all good citizens. The British are in Mesopotamia as temporary mandatories of an Independent Arab State, in the setting up of which they are to assist, and which they are to protect until such time as it can stand by itself. But the Arabs whom they were to assist and protect are in revolt against them: hence the 70,000 troops and an annual expenditure

¹ Speech in the House on Aug. 10.

² The Treaty of Paris in June, 1919, which guaranteed the independence of the Republic of Poland, gave no support to the extreme Polish claim which would have set up the eastern frontiers of 1772, taking in over 400,000 square kilometres of Russian territory and a population of over 20 millions, two-thirds of which are Russian.

of £35,000,000 to support them and the civil administration. Now if, in accord with the announcement of the Mandate in the House on June 23rd, our duties there are to frame a constitution "in consultation with the people of Mesopotamia, and with due regard to the rights, wishes, and interests of all the communities in the country," what is the reason of the uprising of so many of the Arabs? Colonel Lawrence, the chief British agent in Syria during the war, puts it down to a failure to use the educated Arabs as officials. According to that remarkable man, there are 450 British officials in the country, and less than 100 speak Arabic. *The Times*,¹ which in this matter has the backing of most of the press, deprecates the use of the word "rebels" to designate the discontented Arabs, and says plainly that "the people of Mesopotamia have revolted because they object to the proposed mandate, and still more because they dislike the manner in which British authority is being exercised over them," inasmuch as it includes "taxation enormously in excess of the average incidence of taxation in India, although Mesopotamia has been half derelict for centuries, is notoriously impoverished, and has been ravaged for years by war." Other papers say plainly that we are there for the corn and oil,² which are intended to recoup us for our outlay. But the corn and oil belong primarily to the Arabs, and in any case would not enrich the State and relieve the taxpayer, but only provide dividends for the private shareholder. If Labour, which denounces the defence of Poland as a "Capitalist war," really wants to find a typical instance of the sort it should turn to Mesopotamia.

**Egyptian
Independence
at last.**

The recognition of Egyptian independence which British statesmen ever since the occupation in 1883 have pledged themselves over and over again to restore, has been recommended by the Milner commission, which was appointed in September last year to investigate and report on what should be done to introduce "a measure of local self-government." This announcement will be welcomed by all lovers of justice, for the "occupation," which was of great material benefit to the country in many ways, had lasted so long that people began to disbelieve those solemn pledges, actually some sixty in number, especially when the war-time Protectorate, which brought Egypt for the time into the British Commonwealth but which was officially declared to be a means of securing her integrity and independence, was not immediately removed on the cessation of war. The refusal first to admit Egyptian representatives to the Peace Conference and then, when they did reach Paris, to listen to them, the insertion in the German Peace Treaty of a clause demanding

¹ August 19: Leader.

² *E.g., To-day and To-morrow*, July-Aug., pp. 130—133.

recognition of the British Protectorate, and the suppression by force of Egyptian meetings of protest, naturally deepened this impression, so that the findings of the Milner Commission comes as a great relief to those who were inclined to despair of a new order of international relations emerging from the war. And the taxpayer too will feel relief when his commitments in Egypt are limited to safeguarding the canal. Egypt may for a time not be so well administered or so materially prosperous as she has been, but, as the famous aphorism tells us, good government is no proper substitute for self-government when that is due.

**The "New
Witness" and
the Jews.**

We have spoken elsewhere of the strange developments in Palestine consequent on Mr. Balfour's assurance that Palestine should become "the national home of the Jews." Unhappily for that project, Palestine is already the national home of the Arab people, Moslem and Christian, who already live there and who strongly resent any State-aided immigration of a foreign and not very acceptable race. His Eminence the Cardinal, as far as we know, has been the only public man to call attention to the danger, and, strange to say, no secular paper has emphasized his warning. Even the *New Witness*, so keenly alive to the Semitic menace and so vigorous in denouncing it, took no notice of this authentic instance of the evil influence of Jewish finance. Perhaps the financial straits of the paper itself, of which we learn with genuine regret, has distracted its attention, or perhaps it is so overjoyed at the prospect of getting some Jews out of Europe that it is blinded to the incidental iniquities of their departure.

Regarding the fate of the *New Witness* itself, we sincerely trust that all who love honest journalism—*rara avis in terris*—will combine to help it in its difficulties. It is boycotted by advertisers, it is ignored by the commercialized press, the falsehoods and hypocrisies of which it unsparingly exposes, it has arrayed against it all the corrupt influences of politics, it is hated by the international Jew: if it goes we shall be deprived of a great instrument for clear thinking and honest dealing, and there is nothing to take its place. Despite the oddities of certain cranks who have occasional access to its pages, it stands in the main for the Catholic tradition, with a better understanding of that tradition than some professedly Catholic papers always show. It will be a bad day for English journalism if it goes under.

**The threatened
Coal Strike.**

Like just wars, justifiable strikes are hateful and desperate expedients, certain to do harm and not assured of doing good. But unjust strikes, like unjust wars, are criminal outrages, wrong in themselves because breaches of contract, evil in their consequences to individual and community. As we write the

leaders of the miners are trying to engineer a coal-strike, with the object of forcing a particular economic system upon the mining industry. It is a phase in the war against Capitalism to which many of the workers in this country are committed, because in their eyes the Capitalist system, *as it is now worked*, stands for the unjust subordination of human rights and dignity to mere material ends. "Unjust, as it is now worked and has always been worked since the industrial revolution"—that is their charge. On the truth of it depends the justness of their projected strike. Now the right to strike, as we have often said, is the one thing which distinguishes the freeman from the slave. It is the most essential part of the human dignity of the worker, for it means he is a man and not a machine. But that is all the more reason why it should not be rashly or wantonly employed. It should be reserved for the vindication of great issues, not prostituted to sordid ends. According to their own declaration the miners in this instance are striking (1) to cheapen coal and (2) to raise their own wages. Now, since their wages are paid out of profits on coal, what they are aiming at is clearly a diminution of the owners' profits. Is this a *nodus vindice dignus*? For the supposed benefit of the coal-consumer they are planning to inflict untold hardship and loss upon the whole community, including their own families: for a few more shillings a week they are aiming a deadly blow at the industries of the country on the prosperity of which the welfare of millions depends. They may say—then, why not blame the owners who won't give in? The owners ought not to give in save to the manifest claims of justice. Are the miners' claims so manifestly just? That surely is a matter of fact easily ascertainable by the production of figures, provided *all* the figures are produced. The owners are entitled to a fair profit. What is a fair profit? Around this question, surely one not to be settled by violence but by calm debate on *all* the facts, the whole dispute centres.

**Is Capitalism
to
Survive?**

We have often said that if Capitalism as an economic system perishes, it will die of the abuses which it has allowed to grow up with it. The concentration of wealth in a few hands, which causes the multitudinous poor to be dependent on them for a livelihood, is an abuse which the Church has denounced over and over again, and which Catholics should, with even more vigour than Socialists, strive to remedy. The remedy lies, not in the abolition of private property, the holding of which is a natural indefeasible right of man as man, but in its more universal diffusion. An acute critic of the present system, Mr. Joseph Clayton, in recent issues of *Blackfriars*, has questioned the advisability of making private trade-profits at all, or of living by dividends. But although, as he rightly points out, the

mediæval Christian would have denounced as sheer usury the modern practice of living by lending money (which is what we do whenever we invest our superfluous funds), he does not maintain that the Capitalist system, together with its correlative the wage system, is intrinsically immoral. That were implicitly to assert that the Church, which uses the system, is false to her function as guardian of the moral law. He simply applies the one pragmatic test by which all merely human economic or political arrangements must be judged, viz., does it work? Does it make for the common welfare? If not, if it has outgrown its usefulness in stimulating production, inventiveness and material comfort, if even the amount of good inherent in it is out-balanced by the hardship it necessitates, then, he contends, the public welfare demands that it should be set aside. All our industrial unrest, which war-results have not caused but only intensified, the vicious circle of high wages and higher prices, the shameless profiteering, the luxury of the idle rich, unemployment, bad housing, strikes and lock-outs, can never be cured unless man ceases to exploit, with the view of escaping the human burden of work, his fellow-man. Mr. Clayton, we gather, thinks that the Capitalist system cannot be freed from its abuses, that legislation to limit fortunes and profits to a just maximum will always be ineffective; and so he advocates—not nationalization, the mere substitution of a public for a private Capitalist—but universal co-operation. What the workers in their hostility to Capitalism are blindly striving for is justice, but they are misled by the shibboleths of nationalization and State-ownership, and so are merely calling for a change of masters, whilst the Capitalists, in their greater blindness, are trying to entrench themselves behind huge impersonal trusts and amalgamations. Conflict is inevitable, unless both sides are taught to realize that welfare can be secured without wealth, and that the bounteous earth and its inexhaustible riches can easily afford a competence for all, if only some will not seek more than their share. No one can teach them who does not hold that faith himself. We commend to the attention of all earnest Catholics those two articles of Mr. Clayton, as well as the thoughtful study of the industrial situation by a somewhat less radical thinker in our present issue. The Church does not commit herself to any form of human policy: that is not her business: but her children should be the keenest to discern the needs of each changing age and the first to fulfil them.

**Law and Order
in
Ireland.**

The reign of terror in Ireland still continues. In the north there are "pogroms" of Catholics conducted by Orange bigots who make politics the excuse for venting their religious rancour. Elsewhere the war against the armed police goes on, and the armed police in retaliation attack, not their assailants, but the

civil population whom it is their business to protect, and wantonly destroy their property. We protested last month against the murder of policemen, both as against God's law and against the true interests of Ireland. What is urged in palliation or justification of the crime—that the police are in effect a military force employed by a foreign Government, that they themselves began the outrages and are indeed the chief aggressors,¹ that they and the soldiery in their frequent raids loot the houses they search just as if they were in an enemy country—all this may be granted without removing the assassinations from the category of murder. For murder is the direct killing of another (who is not an aggressor on one's own life), without public authority, such, that is, as is given to the hangman or the soldier in war. Now, no public authority in Ireland has authorized the shooting at sight of policemen or soldiers, as if they were enemies in the field. The only *de facto* Government there, besides that represented by the Castle, is held to be the Republic set up by the Sinn Fein elected representatives, and that body has never declared war against England. Therefore, there is no justification either for the assassinations or for the wild outbursts of revenge which follow and again provoke them. The lawless behaviour of the supporters of law in the performance of their orders, which orders themselves are often arbitrary and unfair, naturally brings the law into contempt, but two wrongs can never cancel one another; we may not do evil that good may come.

Meanwhile, there are gleams of hope even in the chaos created by two rival Governments exercising authority in the same limited area. The intransigence of the Ulster folk is disappearing, whether through a love of country which sees that the only way to peace and prosperity is national unity, or through the economic pressure brought on their banks and manufacturers by the rest of Ireland. And once that groundless intransigence goes, when the nation now artificially sundered is one again, then, under whatever polity it lives, a united Ireland will find no profit in being hostile to England, but will become, at last and permanently, a sister and a friend.

**How England
influences
Irish Mentality.**

One of the saddest sights one saw in a recent visit to Ireland, a sight more significant of English domination than the ubiquitous khaki, was the journalistic literature, discharged from the steamer literally in tons on the Kingstown pier. When one

¹ An Irish correspondent calls our attention to a section in Mr. Erskine Childers' *Military Rule in Ireland*, a sober, well-documented pamphlet, which gives what he styles the other side—"Let us now arrive at totals for the whole four years, May, 1916—March, 1920. The Castle 'attributes to Sinn Fein' less than 2,000 outrages, including 36 murders: Sinn Fein specifically charges against the Castle 35,636 acts of aggression, including forty-five murders and seven deaths due to prison treatment." Since the pamphlet was issued the number of outrages on both sides has, alas! enormously increased.

contemplates the characteristics of our secular press,—the picture papers' constant appeal to pruriency, the moral crimes and scandals so exhaustively described, the complete abandonment of the Christian revelation as a standard of belief or conduct, the subordination of truth to political or commercial exigencies, and the universal contempt for the Catholic tradition for which Ireland still stands, one must needs be perplexed that such mental nourishment should be absorbed in such quantities by a Christian nation. For Ireland still reacts with vigour to any assault upon the sacred ideals of the faith. Her native press, inferior though it be in material equipment, would tolerate no such sapping of the marriage-tie as we constantly find in English papers, no such brazen advocacy of "free love," communal nurseries and the like abominations that an appalling woman from America has been recently allowed to print over here. Why then does Ireland import what she would hate to produce at home? We read of the good work of the Irish Vigilance Society in bringing about the exclusion from news-shops of the viler classes of papers from England. Let us hope that this wholesome influence will be indefinitely multiplied throughout the land, and that it will become a mark of patriotism to support a clean, indigenous press, a press that will adequately purvey the news of the world, whilst upholding in its comments the Christian principles to which we owe our civilization.

**Catholics and
the Ministry of
Health.**

At the Liverpool Congress a long-drawn newspaper dispute between Catholics as to the character of the new Health Ministry and the right attitude to take towards it came to a head in public debate, and we trust was finally resolved. For we Catholics do not dispute about principles, though we may about the ground and manner of their application. If the Health Ministry is certainly being made a means of enforcing the immoral views of the advanced eugenists upon the community, it must be uncompromisingly resisted; if it is even liable to be so misused, it must be watched with the greatest vigilance; if it can be utilized, with safety to morals, for the benefit of our poor, then it should be so utilized. The fact that its officials act differently and profess different ideals in different parts of the country, make the adoption of a common policy difficult. The most we can at present do is to scrutinize its action very carefully, and immediately raise the alarm if we find that the taxpayers' money is being used to promote immoral and pernicious fads.

Our fundamental objection to this whole elaborate structure of "public assistance" for indigence is that it presupposes the continuance of a state of things which it should be the aim of every true reformer to sweep away. It is muddle-headed, topsyturvy legislation. In face of the existence of a C3 population, the proper course should clearly be to find out its causes and

then to remove them, rather than merely tinker at their effects. The chief causes of preventible ill-health are inadequate food, clothing and shelter. Therefore, the whole energies and resources of the State should, in the first instance, have been directed, not to various curative health devices, not even to the improvement and extension of education, but to the sweeping away of slums of every sort in town and country, and the abolishing of sweating and unemployment. In such measures we should have eugenics of the right sort: let us make accessible the conditions of a decent family life, and the rest will follow.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Lying and the preservation of Secrets [A. Vermeersch in *Gregorianum*, July, 1920, p. 425].

Non-resistance, The Ethics of [L. Watts, S.J., in *Catholic World*, August, 1920, p. 577].

Pagan Adults and Salvation [Cardinal Billot in *Etudes*, August 20, 1920, p. 385].

Spiritualism: the danger of the Ouija Board [J. McClorey, S.J., in *The Queen's Work*, August, 1920].

Spiritualistic Phenomena not all natural [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Dublin Review*, July, 1920, p. 94].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglicanism shown to be Erastian by the Dean of Canterbury [*Tablet*, August 14, 1920, p. 209].

Bible, The, and Magic [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Dublin Review*, July, 1920, p. 89].

Lambeth Conference, Criticism of [*Tablet*, August 21, 28, 1920, pp. 237, 268: *Universe*, August 20, 27, 1920, pp. 8, 1: Canon Barry in *Catholic Times*, August 28, 1920, p. 7: *Month*, Sept., 1920, p. 255].

Mannix, Archbishop, The case of ["The Man Mannix," by Shane Leslie in *New Witness*, August 13, 1920, p. 286: Paul L. Blakely, S.J., in *America*, July 31, 1920, p. 341].

Reformation, Wales and the [Mgr. Barnes in *Dublin Review*, July, 1920, p. 110].

Socialists and Religion [J. Verdier in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, August 1, 1920, p. 415].

Wells, Mr., "Outlines of History" refuted [Dr. Downey in *Month*, Aug., Sept., 1920, pp. 142, 216].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Armenia, The Tragedy of [W. G. Smith in *Catholic World*, July, 1920, p. 485].

Catholic Federation in U.S.A. [J. Siedenburg S.J., in *Catholic World*, July, 1920, p. 433].

Catholic Missions, The Allies and [A. J. Muench in *America*, July 31, 1920, p. 346].

Church and State in present Germany [L. Crouzil in *Revue du Clergé Français*, August 1—15, 1920, p. 81].

Profit-sharing not a complete solution of industrial unrest [Rev. P. J. Vesey in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, July, 1920, p. 8].

REVIEWS

I—THE PHILOSOPHY OF MYSTICISM¹

MR. WATKIN has given us a volume, which demands close reading, on the Metaphysics and Psychology of Mysticism—close reading in more than one sense, for we have a serious stylistic grievance against the author, which we must touch upon at the very outset. We refer to the almost Teutonic overloading of his paragraphs. Time after time, we come across paragraphs of twelve or fifteen hundred words, covering three or four pages. In a work of such length on such a subject this is surely a capital defect. The reader sighs for the long-postponed release, and tends to become captiously critical of any needless repetitions or over-fullness of phrase. Mr. Watkin is not a tedious or long-winded writer on the whole, but we confess there were moments when we would gladly have hurled both these epithets at his head.

The coining of new terms is a privilege which no reasonable critic would deny to the exponent of a new science. We should stipulate, however, for a wise economy in such innovations. We fear Mr. Watkins has sometimes overpassed the limit of such economy. Are such words as "trans-subjective" and "extra-godly" really wanted? Does "pain-repression" quite convey the meaning that the author puts upon it? And is it any gain to call God "the Unlimited" instead of the "Infinite"? We mention these things because we feel that we shall hear from Mr. Watkin again, and it really becomes a serious matter when authors begin accumulating a peculiar vocabulary of their own. In twenty years' time, or less, such a man is liable to become quite unreadable on account of a merely dictional originality.

It is time now to say that Mr. Watkin seems to us to possess an originality of quite another order. He has really a fine, speculative gift, and, if he will only cut up his paragraphs and prune his vocabulary as we have indicated, we make no doubt he will be able to produce valuable work in the field he has chosen, or, perhaps, as we shall suggest, in some other field. He is clearly an enthusiastic admirer of the great Catholic Mystics, and, being himself a Catholic, should be able to interpret them, more intelligently and sym-

¹ By Edward Ingram Watkin. London: Grant Richards, Ltd. Pp. 412. Price, 21s. net.

pathetically, than most of those who "take up" Mysticism. As this work shows, Mr. Watkin is a man of wide reading and a reflective mind. [An index, by the way, would be a great charity to the reader—or, at least, analytic chapter headings.] We have not, however, been able to convince ourselves that he has any detailed acquaintance with Scholastic Theology. He seems to us to under-estimate the mediæval psychology, and to be too emphatic in his acceptance of the subliminal or "trap-door" theory (or rather terminology) of the modern school. We believe that a careful study of St. Thomas's doctrine of the soul would be useful for Mr. Watkin, as showing how very completely the whole metaphysics of the subject can be framed in the old categories.

As our space is limited we hope we shall not be considered to detract from a general commendation of the book, if we confine ourselves to one or two points in which we found ourselves disagreeing with the author. The chapters on "The Passive Night of Spirit" are undoubtedly among the most interesting in the whole work, and bringing together a great deal of suggestive speculation on the doctrine of purgatory, viewed as a preparation or purification for the mystical beatitude of heaven—the completion of the work of detachment and mortification left unfinished at death. The idea is, of course, not unfamiliar, but Mr. Watkin has done a service by bringing together many passages of the mystics which illustrate and enforce it. The penal or vindictive aspect of purgatory is probably more prominent in the Catholic mind than its initiatory aspect; and it is really an obscure point how far any mere imperfections which are not formally venial sins detain the soul from the sight of God.

It is in the chapter on "The Negative Way" that we find ourselves dissenting most often from Mr. Watkin's views. Take the following passage on ascetical Detachment (p. 196): "*The majority of mankind cannot be actually free in this life from the love and desire of created goods for their own sake*, or even from the exclusive possession of such goods. They can, however, and, indeed, should be potentially and radically free, by making a constant choice of God before all things and by a constant rejection of any and every created good that cannot be possessed, not only without positive sin, but without any degree or kind of opposition to His known Will in their regard." The portion of the first sentence, which we have italicised, seems to us indefensible.

In the second sentence the use of "potentially" and "radically" is misleading. The sort of freedom described in this sentence is that demanded by the Beatitudes and other portions of Christ's teaching *which were addressed to all alike*, and is, in every sense an *actual* freedom; not actual abdication, indeed,—this is the vocation of the few—but actual spiritual detachment. This detachment is the rule of Christ for all, and the order and well-being of society by no means demand (as the author seems to hint) its setting aside for any class of Christians.

From this error, the author is led (p. 197) to express the view that "St. John [of the Cross] failed to realize sufficiently the spiritual incapacity and the narrow limitations of the average man." We venture to think it is Mr. Watkin, with many of his contemporaries, including, of course, the average man himself, who fail to realize the expansive possibilities of human nature when enlightened by faith and honestly obedient to grace. "Love not the world" was preached to all. Here are two questions which must be kept distinct;—the question of vocation to the mystical union in this life—this is exceptional, or, at least, not universal—and the question of the vocation to detachment and abnegation; this is the doctrine of the Cross, and the rule of life—not a mere ideal—for all. Mr. Watkin (p. 199) himself makes the excellent remark: "In communities where faith is strong, as in mediæval Europe and in modern Ireland, Brittany and the Tyrol, the general level of unworldliness—that is, of detachment from creatures and attachment to God as the supreme end of life—is enormously higher than any conceivable by those acquainted with the materialistic civilization of Western Europe to-day."

A statement open to misapprehension occurs on p. 199: "Nor need we suppose that the ultimate actual detachment from creatures will be equal in all who enjoy the beatific vision." This is without warrant. Can Mr. Watkin produce a single Catholic theologian in support of this speculation? On the contrary, it is the teaching of all the Catholic Doctors that in Heaven the adhesion of mind and heart to God by the Beatific Vision and Love will be absolutely complete and indefectible in all the blessed. It is surely ill-advised in a Catholic writer to throw out such *obiter dicta* on theological subjects without first ascertaining their conformity with the mind of the Church as reflected in her theology. A worse example

still of the same amateurishness occurs in this note to p. 410: "Because I speak of the 'eternal suffering' of hell, I do not accept the traditional view of a physical fire torment. This view has never been defined by the Church and lacks the consensus of the Fathers. Indeed, I do not believe in any pain extrinsic to the necessary consequences of the soul's eternal self-exclusion from supernatural union with God. On the entire subject of eternal punishment I accept in substance the view expounded by Baron von Hügel." We shall say of this passage only that it would not be easy to compress more theological temerity into a few lines, while the "argument from authority" in the last sentence is, with all respect, something of an anti-climax.

Again, on p. 411: "By orthodox mystics I mean men who were both mystics and orthodox. Many Quietists—*e.g.*, Madame Guyon—were genuine mystics." How does Mr. Watkin know that?

Other passages show that Mr. Watkin is not perfectly equipped for his task in ascetical matters either. He has confined himself apparently to the higher flights without due grounding in the elements of Catholic spirituality. Otherwise, he could never have written, as he does on p. 198: "It would be clearly irrational for a merchant to bestow such love on his trade as an artist might legitimately bestow on his art, for art is more spiritual and therefore more real and more Godlike than trade." This is a Hellenic rather than a Christian view. To a Catholic, the merchant unduly absorbed in his business is neither less nor more perverse than the artist inordinately devoted to his art. Each is alike, in some degree, failing in due concentration upon his one last end. "Art for art's sake" is as spiritually ruinous as "gain for gain's sake." We cannot serve two masters; whether the second be Apollo or Mammon makes no difference in the supernatural order. The difference is merely an æsthetic or (what is much the same), in the Greek sense, an ethical one.

We should be loth to imply that this essay is not, on the whole, a fine performance. Our complaint rather is that such blemishes as we have indicated were not removed before publication. Our impression is that Mr. Watkin shows a marked philosophical gift, but that his work is marred by an excessive boldness both of speculation and expression, against which he could easily have provided. It would be

well for him either to study theology in earnest from approved sources, or to confine himself to purely philosophical theories. Finally, a book which professedly aims at giving the Catholic teaching concerning mysticism should surely have been equipped with the diocesan *Imprimatur*.

2—NEW BIBLICAL WORKS¹

THE long delay of over four years which has occurred since the last fascicle—the translation of St. Mark's Gospel—of the Westminster Version appeared, has probably led many to suppose that this laudable enterprise had been abandoned, and they will be correspondingly relieved by the issue of the present double fascicle, containing II Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, which completes Vol. III. of the four accorded to the New Testament. Such fatality has dogged the endeavour to present an accurate and readable Catholic version of the Bible in English from the day when, owing to Wiseman's strange apathy, the task actually entrusted to Newman was allowed to lapse, to the present, that it would have been a thousand pities if even the cataclysm of the European war and the chaos of the European peace had been allowed to destroy this later enterprise. It goes slowly in any case, for it represents, not the work of a leisured commission appointed *ad hoc*, but the labours of already fully-occupied professors and scholars; *eppur si muove*, and let us be thankful that it moves at all.

The issue of these three epistles marks a definite advance. Now Vol. III., "St. Paul's Epistle to the Churches," in many respects the most difficult part of the enterprise, is brought to a close, and both translators and editors are entitled to our warm congratulations. For the promise they made, the ideal of their undertaking, has been substantially fulfilled. They have given us an eminently "readable" St. Paul, whether we consider the typographical arrangement which, by supplying cross-headings and marginal insets, by using the full breadth of the page instead of columns, and by placing chapter and

¹ The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, Vol. III. Part III. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, by the General Editors. Part IV. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, by the Rev. A. Keogh, S.J. *The Epistle to the Romans*, by the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. London: Longmans. Pp. xxxvi. 120. Price, 3s. 9d. (wrapper), 4s. 9d. (boards).

The Passion and Glory of Christ. By Mgr. Poelzl. Translated from the German by A. M. Buchanan, M.A.: revised and edited by Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. London: Herder. Pp. 382. Price, 14s. net.

The Temptation of Jesus. By W. J. Foxell, M.A. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. viii. 194. Price, 6s. 6d. net.

verse references outside the text, presents the matter in a very pleasing form, and the various introductions, notes, and references, which help to elucidate the meaning. One need only contrast a page of this version with the same matter as set forth by the Douay to appreciate the gain.

The General Editors announce that they are responsible for all that concerns the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, an Epistle which, though not of very great doctrinal significance, is full of St. Paul's personality and abounds in glimpses of his own character and history and of his relations with his converts. The translation is easy yet dignified: as we have often remarked, St. Paul never cultivated style as such, and his translator is always tempted to round off his roughnesses and fill out his gaps. But our commentators confine their elucidations to the notes, which are invariably useful. That on St. Paul's *stimulus carnis* may be cited as a specimen.

Galatians and Romans come fitly together because both deal with the same theme—St. Paul's endeavour to dissociate the spirit and practices of Christianity from those of Judaism. Father Keogh holds and strongly supports in his introduction the view that Galatians is the earliest extant epistle of St. Paul, and, therefore, that it was written some eight years before that to the Romans. The similarity of subject is no obstacle, for clearly the separation of the converted Jews from those that still observed the Mosaic law was a measure of the first importance for the growth of Christianity and a difficulty which would constantly recur. Father Keogh does not discuss the controversial issues so frequently and ineptly raised on the subject of St. Paul's "reproof" to St. Peter, but his notes are generally much to the point.

In the more formal treatise addressed to the Romans on the true Christian spirit and the essential equality of all races of men in the face of the Gospel, all St. Paul's characteristics as a writer and thinker are emphasized, and Father Lattey had a hard and heavy task to make the Apostle's meaning plain whilst keeping to an accurate rendering of the Apostle's words. He must be commended for a fine performance. Both in Introduction and Appendix ("St. Paul's Doctrine of Justification") he has elaborated the principles of the Apostle's teaching, in the light of which many obscurities in the text yield up their sense. But how difficult that text is, used as a medium to convey the great and deep ideas with which the Holy Spirit inspired St. Paul, the

details of the mystery hidden from the foundation of the world which it was his task to mould into human language! It says much for the translator that even without his fairly copious notes the version reads so easily and intelligibly.

We trust that English-speaking Catholics will recognize the real importance of the Westminster Version. Even though it be not itself perfect, still it is a necessary preliminary and a considerable advance to the production of a worthy rendering of the Word of God into the English tongue, and a valuable help to that perusal and study of it which is our duty as Catholics.

If all the Gospels are interesting, particular interest attaches to the narrative of the sufferings and resurrection of our Lord, for therein we read the record of our redemption. So the large work by Mgr. F. X. Poelzl, S.T.D., translated from the German and entitled *The Passion and Glory of Christ*, will be very acceptable to the devout Catholic, and especially to the Biblical student. The whole brief narrative of the Evangelists, as we know, is full of problems of various sorts, which, if they do not affect our faith or piety, still clamour for solution. In Mgr. Poelzl's work they are very fully set forth and discussed, and whilst the author gives his own conclusion, he likewise summarizes those of others. The vexed question, *e.g.*, whether our Lord's Last Supper was the Jewish Pasch, is answered in the affirmative, contrary to the view expressed in our own pages in July. The apparent conflict, again, between the various accounts of the Resurrection, of which such play is made by the rationalist, is here shown to be only apparent, our difficulty in fact being which of the many possible solutions to choose. Enough has been said to show what an advantage this book, bringing together so much that is to be found in many separate volumes, will confer on the student of Scripture.

Mr. Foxell's book is a discussion of one of the most mysterious episodes in our Lord's life—His temptation in the desert. The writer is in the main orthodox, but he shows (p. 110), in common with most Anglicans, that strange misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of asceticism, which is part of the Protestant mentality. We miss, too, that assured teaching *de Scientia Christi*, provided by Catholic theology. No Catholic could write of the God-man that "with growing years there went a deepening consciousness of Sonship" (p. 103). Nor is it possible that Satan, know-

ing Christ to be the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, should have suggested evil to Him. The author, moreover, does not see (p. 99) that the sinlessness, or rather the impeccability, of Christ arises from the fact of the Hypostatic Union: sin is an act of the personality, and in Christ the Person is Divine. Sin, therefore, in the God-man was not merely a moral, but a physical impossibility. We are aware that there are expressions in St. Paul difficult to reconcile with this fact, but the whole relations between the Divine Personality and the human nature of our Lord bristle with difficulties. However, considering that the author is outside Catholic tradition in these high matters, he has made astonishingly few mistakes, and his reverent study of this mystery may be recommended.

3—THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF GRACE¹

THE prevailing impression among Protestants is that in the Catholic Church little attention is paid to the Scriptural doctrine of Grace, so much so, that whereas by Protestants the salvation of the soul is attributed wholly and entirely to the grace of God, by Catholics it is attributed exclusively to the merits of their own good works. This impression, as every Catholic knows, is wholly false, the truth being that the Catholic system is rooted in the doctrine of grace, and now many Protestants are beginning to realize that truth. Hence a growing desire for a better understanding of the Catholic doctrine on this subject is widespread, and, especially among the Catholic laity, a desire to have it expounded to them in a way which is not encumbered by theological technicalities, and yet is sufficiently thorough to satisfy the mentality of educated men.

A book of this kind has now been published by Father George Joyce, one of the Professors of Theology at the Jesuit College of St. Beuno's. It is very thorough, and will tax the intelligence of the lay-reader who seeks to understand it, but it will abundantly repay such a reader's industry, whilst at the same time it will be found useful even by priestly students, who will recognize in its composition the mind of a thoroughly competent theologian, and the pen of an able writer.

To go into the details of this many-sided but symmetrical

¹ By G. H. Joyce, S.J. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. xiv. 267. Price, 6s. net. 1920.

subject would be quite impossible within the limits of a short book-notice. We must be content to indicate a leading point or two in the Church's teaching on grace. We are wont to distinguish between actual and sanctifying grace, and to explain that actual grace is of the nature of a transient gift, granted to us by the divine goodness, to enable us to perform spiritual acts beneficial to our souls, which acts, without its aid, would be altogether beyond our power; whilst on the other hand, sanctifying grace is of the nature of a spiritual state wherein we are elevated above our natural condition and qualified to take our place hereafter as co-heirs with Christ. One of the difficulties, indeed the first of our difficulties, when we search in Holy Scripture for the authority for the doctrine of sanctifying, as distinguished from actual grace, is that we nowhere find the phrase there. In fact, it first occurs in early Christian theology, which, as Father Joyce explains, was only expressing in a convenient term what is clearly and in many ways laid down by St. Paul and St. John. For in the teaching of these inspired writers it is affirmed over and over again that by redemption we are made the sons of God, and the distinction between being made sons, and not left as servants of God, is insisted on. We are the latter essentially as the creatures of God, but "the relation of the creature to the Creator is utterly different from that of the child to his father. A child has the right to share his father's home, his father's happiness, his father's intimate companionship. He is in a sense one with his father." Creation gives to man no title to this. It is true it was given to Adam, and meant for transmission to his entire offspring, a gift which he forfeited both for himself and for them by his sin, of which we read in Genesis. Hence we are born in "original sin" from which we are restored again to our "original sonship" by the Redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ. "God sent forth his Son . . . that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Here the term "adoption" is to be carefully noticed, for "adoption," even as understood by the Romans, conferred a "new birth" only by legal fiction, whereas in the Christian sense, as expounded by St. Paul, it implies "a fundamental alteration in man's status, bringing him into the very closest fellowship with God," conferring on him new powers and endowments. And this new destiny and these new equipments are given him through Baptism, for which reason the Fathers

speak of Baptism in such glowing terms; for instance, St. Leo says "the water of baptism is for every man who is born again as it were the Virgin's womb; and the same Spirit fills the font who filled the Virgin"—with which compare the language of the Preface sung on Holy Saturday.

This is the fundamental point; but in the chapters that follow, the author explains the principles of supernatural action, the theological virtues, the infused moral virtues, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and again, in other chapters, the laws of the acquisition of sanctifying grace, of perseverance in grace, of merit and the *ex operato* action of the sacraments in the Church, the home of grace and glory.

Many items in this programme invite the reader's attentive consideration, and even prayerful pondering. Such are the precise function of the supernatural virtues and their relation to the natural virtues, the confusion of the whole doctrine of sanctification by the Lutheran doctrine of Justification, the compatibility of the doctrine of merits in the just with the all-sufficing merits of Christ; and again, the recognition of the Church as the home of grace and the various problems connected with the spiritual state of good folk outside her fold.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Father Joyce for enriching our spiritual literature with this discerning treatise.

SHORT NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL.

THE more the individual recognizes the providential rôle of the Mother of God in the economy of his soul's salvation, and the more, in consequence he is moved to grateful love of her as the channel of grace, the more sure he should make himself of the dogmatic basis of her greatness, which, in truth, is wide and deep enough to support a vast edifice of devotion. In *Marie et le Dogme* (Beauchesne: 3.00 fr.), by Ch. Gonthier, he will find an admirable discussion of her unique position and prerogatives, and an accurate statement of her work as co-Redemptress, which cannot fail to confirm or enhance his filial affection.

MORAL.

Feeling that man's moral development has not kept pace with his progress in other directions, and that consequently our more perfect, material civilization has not made us more but rather less happy and contented, Father Slater finds the reason in the absence of a fixed and commonly accepted system of morality which would at least provide a standard of right living. Accordingly in *The Foundation of True Morality*

(Benziger: \$1.25) he develops the Catholic conception of Christian morality on such radical points as moral responsibility, the right interpretation of law, casuistry, counsels and precepts, sin and grace, contrasting it throughout with the vague and shifting views of non-Catholic Christians. Thus he shows how in the adoption of the sane, consistent, reasonable moral theology of the Church lies man's only hope of gaining the modicum of happiness which is his destiny here. A very timely and helpful little treatise, made more actual by "modern instances."

DEVOTIONAL.

In his **Talks to Nurses** (Benziger: \$1.50 net) Father Henry Spalding, S.J., deals very fully with the ethics of medical practice in which nurses take so large and important a part. After laying down very fully the principles—the rights of God to obedience to His commandments and certain apposite rights of man—he applies them in a series of "cases," giving the moral solution of each. This will prove an invaluable book for Catholics employed as nurses, Health Visitors, etc., who are so apt amidst non-Catholic influences to fall in with loose views and practices on matters of morality. Father Spalding shows adequate medical knowledge and is able to confirm his decisions by the testimony of accredited physicians.

Father William Roche, S.J., who has laboured so fruitfully to make the Divine Mystery of the Eucharist loved and appreciated, especially by the young, has composed another booklet, **Holy Mass and Communion** (Longmans: 2s. net, paper; 3s. net, boards), intended to make "the Children's Bread" easily assimilated by simple minds. It is a collection of prayers and reflections accompanying each episode in the great drama of the Mass, and suggesting the fitting dispositions. These are further stimulated by a series of beautiful little hymns from the pen of Father J. W. Atkinson, S.J., and a no less beautiful series of illustrations connecting the Mass with events in our Lord's life drawn by T. Baines, jun. To some of the hymns music composed by Sinclair Mantell is assigned. There is here enough and more than enough to keep the youthful attention fixed, and Father Roche is wise in warning the reader to be content with one thought or suggestion at a time.

A book of exceptional value is **The Catholic Student** (Browne and Nolan, Dublin), by the Rev. Dr. Hickey, of Clonliffe, which consists of a series of ten lectures addressed to University men on the fundamental truths of religion. It is not a mere exposition of points of dogma but it has in view the manner in which those truths should actuate, and be expressed in, practice. The treatment is, as was to be expected, scholarly, and much use is made of apt quotations from Holy Scripture and from the great religious classics. But the chief characteristic of these lectures is the skill with which piety is shown to issue rationally in good works and thus to be useful for all things. The world to-day challenges the Catholic, as his atheist companions challenged Ozanam, with "Show us your works." A practical Catholic cannot fail to be an apostle, a slack one is equivalently an apostate, "infideli deterior," according to St. Paul. We hope that Dr. Hickey's book will be widely spread amongst our Catholic youth as a stimulus and guide to a truly Christian life.

Many works on the Roman Breviary have been issued, some liturgical merely, some historical, some devotional, and Father E. J. Quigley, the

author of the latest—**The Divine Office: a Study of the Roman Breviary** (Gill and Son: 7s. 6d. net)—seems to be well acquainted with all that have preceded it, at least in fairly modern times. Of these he gives a critical appreciation for the guidance of those who wish to extend their studies. The merit of his own volume is that it combines within reasonable compass the historical, liturgical, theological and ascetic aspects of the subject, and thus furnishes a handy introduction for the ecclesiastical student, and a ready means whereby the busy priest, grown old and haply over-familiar with the recital of the Office, may renew his interest and devout attention. Father Quigley pays particular attention to the necessity of making the Breviary a real prayer-book, and gives many useful devices for attaining this end.

The "Bar" Convent at York has been the source in recent years of many most valuable additions to English devotional literature, and happily it is a source which shows no signs of running dry. The veteran Mother Mary. Loyola herself acts as sponsor to the latest volume that has been issued thence—**The Sacred Heart and Mine in Holy Communion** (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d. net)—by Sister Mary Philip, who is already responsible for several other treatises of merit. The present book has for sub-title "Thoughts drawn from the Titles of the Sacred Heart and the writings of St. Margaret Mary Alacoque," and the plan of the authoress is to illustrate the litany invocations from the life or writings of the Saint. Thus she has produced a series of meditations well calculated to keep alive in the devout communicant an ever-renewed sense of the infinite value of the Gift received and a desire to return love for love.

HOMILETIC.

We have noticed already many retreat-books from the pen of the Vicar-General of Versailles, M. le Chanoine Millot, addressed to various categories of the faithful, and here comes another—**Retraite de Première Communion Solennelle** (Téqui: 5.00 fr.)—which provides three days' spiritual entertainment for children of an age to appreciate fully the great mystery of the altar. The Canon knows how to speak to children, even about such formidable topics as the four last things, and his pages are full of apposite stories and illustrations.

The book called **Short Sermons for the Sundays of the Year** (Herder: 7s. net) represents a successful endeavour on the part of the Rev. J. R. Newell, O.P., to provide solid dogmatic food for his Sunday congregations. They will be useful to other pastors also, being clear and logical in structure.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

We trust that the recent beatification of Archbishop Oliver Plunket will send many to study the records of his career, for Catholics, now living in peace, may learn thence what the pearl of great price, which they have so easily come by, might reasonably have cost, and non-Catholics may realize what rank injustice and hypocrisy have ever characterized the proscription of the Catholic Faith. Nowhere may these records be studied with more speed and profit than in **Blessed Oliver Plunket: his times and work and death at Tyburn, 1629-1681** (Sands and Co.: 6s.), the extremely able composition of a Sister of Notre Dame. The author shows a competent knowledge of contemporary history, especially of the tangle

of Irish affairs during the reigns of the Stuarts, and the Commonwealth, and guides us securely amidst the strange ecclesiastical politics of the times, complicated as they were by the pressure more or less heavy of the iniquitous penal laws. The life we read almost convinces us that Oliver Plunket might well have been beatified as a Confessor if he had not been a Martyr. But his holiness naturally burnt brighter at the end when in the hands of his enemies. There is nothing in these truthful pages to support the recent unworthy attempt to excuse the English law-court and the Shaftesbury Government from the guilt of legal murder by laying the chief blame for Blessed Oliver's passion and death on the apostate Irish religious and others whom that Government suborned to swear away his life.

We presume that the exciting record of **Adventures Perilous** (Sands and Co.: 5s. net), in which Miss Wilmot-Buxton tells the tale of Father John Gerard's apostolate in England, is based upon the account given by that confessor of the faith of his missionary career in England, and especially of his escape from the Tower. That being so, this sensational story of heroic yet light-hearted courage has the additional merit of being substantially true, and it surely must inspire the Catholic reader and even the non-Catholic with admiration of the men who sacrificed all the joys of life in the service of their Master. Here again we have brought before us the fact that others have laboured and we have reaped the fruit, and the consequent obligation we are under to cherish that fruit and increase it.

A new (second) edition of Dom Michael Barrett's **Calendar of Scottish Saints** (Abbey Press, Fort Augustus: 2s. 6d. net), revised and augmented, shows that his work has been appreciated. The Calendar contains brief biographies and accounts of the place in history of upwards of 160 saints who laboured or were extensively worshipped in Scotland, attached to their appropriate feast days. A great deal of incidental information about holy crosses, wells and shrines is also given, and it is rendered accessible by a copious index.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

With its third edition, Father George Joyce's well-known **Principles of Logic** (Longmans: 12s. net) takes its place amongst the Stonyhurst Series of Philosophical Text-books. This may be considered strange in view of the fact that that series already contains the *Logic* of the late Father Richard Clarke. The explanation is that the later volume supplements much that is defective in the former, but a further reason may be found in the fact that after over a quarter of a century of service the plates of Father Clarke's volume show signs of deterioration, and, as he is no longer here to prepare a new edition, it is hoped that, when his book is no longer available, that of Father Joyce may be ready to take its place in institutions where it has been used as a text-book. Of this latter it is superfluous to give a detailed criticism. The two large editions which have been exhausted since its first appearance a dozen years ago show that it has won a steady welcome amongst students of scholastic philosophy, a welcome which this carefully revised third edition will, we trust, continue to meet with.

FICTION.

Father Cuthbert's gift of story-telling (in the right sense) is only equalled, as readers of our Catholic magazines know, by Miss Grace Christmas's gift in editing them for the public, and that public, when it knows **What Father Cuthbert Knew** (Sands and Co.: 4s.), will be grateful to the writer for a series of interesting and well-told sketches which alike charm and edify.

A little of Daisy Ashford and also of Pamela Bianco goes to help in the composition of **Even Better** (Mary's Meadow Press: 2s. net), a collection of short stories which Miss Catherine O'Connor (aged 14) has made and illustrated for her baby brother, Ælred. But the most of it is Catherine's self, who, under the familiar name of Betty, "commenced author" a good many years ago, and who now shows that she has made wonderful progress in thought and expression. The pictures are a trifle futurist, and it is no reflection on Catherine's art to say that the sweetest picture in the book is the photo-reproduction of herself which forms the frontispiece.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

A wholly excellent purpose is embodied in the striking **Pictures and Chats about Animals** (Evans Bros., London: Teachers' edition, 2s. 6d. net; Pupils', 6d. net), and that is the suppression of every form of cruelty to animals. In the pupils' hands are placed a number of excellent photo-pictures exhibiting dogs and cats and lambs, birds, and horses, generally as being petted by little children. The teachers' copy gives the same pictures with letterpress showing in what various ways they can be used both to teach natural history and right methods of dealing with animals. It should be a great help in kindergartens.

Madame Forbes has made clever use of Hans Andersen's old story, and in **The Emperor's Royal Robes** (B.O. and W.: 1s. 3d. net) has written in rolling rhymed metre a laughable little comedy which will delight many a school audience.

Two articles from our pages by Father Thurston have been reproduced as C.T.S. twopenny pamphlets, viz., **A Sober Condemnation of Spiritualism** and **The Pilgrim Fathers**, both exceedingly "actual" and worthy of wide distribution. As an addition to the C.T.S. devotional section we have **The Mystic Guide** (price 2d.) which, by means of apt prayers and invocations, aims at conducting the aspirant through the stages of purgation and illumination to union with the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier.

The Catholic Social Guild have issued at 2d., a pamphlet containing two papers on the **Catholic Attitude to the Ministry of Health**, the one by Dom G. B. McLaughlin, O.S.B., and the other by Dr. Alexander Mooney, which should do much to guide the Catholic conscience aright on this very practical question. Both authors write moderately, with a sense of responsibility and after a careful examination of the subject, and both, the priest more strongly than the doctor, warn Catholics to be on their guard against a system which takes no formal account of Christian morality and which may easily be applied in opposition to it.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- ADMINISTRATIO "MONUMENTA HISTORICA,"** Madrid.
Exercitia Spiritualia S. Ignatii de Loyola et eorum directoria. Pp. 1282. Price, 24.00 pes.
- AMERICA PRESS,** New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XVIII. Nos. 12-15. Price, 5 c. each.
- BOCCA,** Rome.
La Fisica dei Corpuscoli. By G. Gianfranceschi, S.J. 2nd Edition. Pp. viii. 264. Price, lire 15.
- BROWNE & NOLAN,** Dublin.
The Catholic Student. By Rev. M. Hickey, D.D. Pp. vii. 209.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE,** London.
The Sacred Heart and Mine in Holy Communion. By Sister Mary Philip. Pp. x. 81. Price, 3s. 6d. net. *Blessed Louise de Marillac.* Pp. 32. Price, 4d. net.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.**
Spanish Ballads. Chosen by Guy le Strange. Pp. xii. 218. Price, 10s. 6d. net.
- CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD,** Oxford.
The Catholic Attitude to the Ministry of Health. By J. B. MacLaughlin, O.S.B., and A. P. Mooney, M.D.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,** London.
 Several twopenny Pamphlets.
- FATHERS OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT,** New York.
Under the Eyes of Jesus. Pp. 43.
- HARDING & MORE,** London.
The Dawn of the English Drama. By P. Kirwan. Pp. 72. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
- HAWKESYARD PRIORY,** Rugely.
Ex Umbris: Letters and Papers. Edited by F. R. Devas, O.P. Pp. 187. Price, 5s. 6d. post free.
- KEGAN PAUL & CO.,** London.
A Century of Persecution. By Dr. St. George Hyland. Pp. xvi. 494. Price, 21s. net.
- KING & SON,** London.
Public Services. Pp. iv. 96. Price, 2s. net.
- LONGMANS,** London.
Principles of Logic. By G. H. Joyce. 3rd Edition. Pp. xx. 431. Price, 12s. net. *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures.* Vol. III. Part III. *Second Corinthians.* By the General Editors. Part IV. *Galatians.* By Rev. A. Keogh, S.J. *Romans.* By Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. Pp. xxxvi. 120. Price, 3s. 9d. (wrapper), 4s. 9d. (boards).
- MARY'S MEADOW,** Ludlow.
Even Better. By Catherine O'Connor. Pp. 53. Price, 2s. net.
- SOCIETÀ "VITA E PENSIERO,"** Milan.
Carlo Marx. By Francesco Olgiati. Pp. xix. 337. Price, 9.00 l. *Galileo e la sua Condanna.* By Mons. R. Maiocchi. Pp. 224. Price, 6.00 l. *Religione e Scienza.* By Father A. Gemelli. Pp. xii. 346. Price, 9.75 l. *Guillari di Dio.* Poems selected and Edited by A. Mori. Pp. 186. Price, 5.00 l. *Il Materialismo Storico e il Socialismo.* By Dr. C. Scalia. Pp. xvi. 415. Price, 8.00 l.
- S.P.C.K.,** London.
The Ethiopic Didascalia. By J. M. Harden. Pp. xxiii. 204. Price, 9s. net.
- TÉQUI,** Paris.
Les Soucis d'une Femme du Monde. Pp. 386. Price, 5.00 fr. *L'Autre Vie.* By Mgr. E. Méric. 2 Vols. 4th Edit. Pp. xviii. 337. 400. *Eléments de Philosophie: Introduction Générale.* By Prof. J. Maritain. Pp. xii. 214. Price, 7.50 fr. *Transfigurée par l'Enchavistie.* By L. Lajoie, C.I.M. Pp. x. 110. Price, 1.50 fr.
- TEULINGS',** Bois-le-duc.
Theologia Moralis. By J. Aertyns, C.S.S.R. 2nd Vol. 10th Edit. Pp. 521. Price, 7.50 fr.

